

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

JULY, 1869.

I.—THE FAILURE OF PROTESTANTISM.

Sermons on the Failure of Protestantism, and on Catholicity. By the REV. FERDINAND C. EWER, S. T. D., Rector of Christ Church, New York. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1869.

WE do not intend so much a review of the book, whose title-heads this paper, as a survey of the ground which it professes to explore. No bomb-shell has been thrown into the Protestant encampment of late with such telling effect as this; not, we are inclined to think, on account of the size or dangerous character of the bomb, but because the present uneasy and anxious state of mind among Protestants—a sort of semi-consciousness of weakness and error—allows a panic to be easily created. There is, in the present condition of the public mind in the Protestant world, a foreshadowing of approaching disaster. Her soldiers, in troubled dreams, see a cake of barley bread tumbled into the host, which, rolling against the sacred tent in which her chief treasures are concealed, crushes it to the ground; and when such a Gideon as Rev. Ferdinand C. Ewer, S. T. D., comes with a band of only three hundred, even though it be with empty pitchers, and glare of torches, and blare of trumpets, *mere noise and flash* is enough, at such a time, to create confusion and strike dismay into a strong army, until “every man’s sword is against his fellow,” and a general rout ensues.*

* See Judges vii.

We live in an age of prying curiosity, of bold irreverence, when little respect is shown to the idols of the past. Forms, once venerated, are scouted contemptuously; creeds, once more powerful than the Bible itself, are scornfully repudiated; names, once of almost cabalistic sacredness and power, are bandied about with vulgar disrespect, and reduced to utter impotence.

PROTESTANTISM has been to many millions a word of sacred spell—the synonym of Christianity. It has stood for all that is spiritual in religion, pure in morals, free and progressive in intellect, energizing and ennobling in social development. To question its integrity, or insinuate a doubt of its perfection, was to inherit ecclesiastical damnation. To overthrow Popery, and make the world Protestant, was the brightest dream of millennial glory that cheered the toils and conflicts of the champions of Protestantism. Its contradictory creeds, its jarring sects, its hopeless discords, its State religions, its disgusting formalisms, its extravagant reactions of Pietism, Mysticism, and Rationalism, its persecutions and oppressions—all these paled into nothingness before the magical glory of the name PROTESTANT, and the luster of its achievements in the emancipation of the nations from spiritual and ecclesiastical thrall-dom. To question its merits, or accuse it of weakness or wrong, was to go over to Popery, or to become infidel. It was safe, only, to swell the popular cry, “Great is Diana of the Ephesians.” But, note the change. Here comes a bold iconoclast, with not a very large hammer, nor vigorous arm, and smites this image directly in the face, and rudely mutilates it, and even attempts to tumble it from its pedestal and expose it, a broken and helpless thing, to the scorn of the world; and there is scarcely a man to lift a finger against him! It is not unlike, in its results, to the scene described by Luke in Ephesus (Acts xix): “Some, therefore, cried one thing, and some another; for the assembly was confused, and the more part knew not wherefore they were come together.”

We have read, with some care, Mr. Ewer's sermons. We have been at pains to read numerous comments and replies from the religious press. We are compelled, in candor, to say that, while the sermons are not remarkable for logical consistency or critical acumen, they are entirely superior to any thing we have yet seen in the replies; and Mr. Ewer's rejoinders, so far as he has rejoined, leave

him master of the field. We have never seen, in Protestant ranks, such chariness, such trembling reconnaissance, such timid skirmishing, and failure to grapple manfully with the foe. This, we repeat, is owing to no prodigious stature or invincible prowess in the Goliath that defies them—for we hope to make it appear, before we close, that he is altogether vulnerable—but because he has spoken to the consciences of Protestants when he declares Protestantism a failure, and only puts into a bold utterance that which was vaguely and dimly brooding over the religious consciousness of the world.

We are far from conceding, however, that Protestantism is, in any peculiar sense, a failure, as compared with Roman Catholicism, or Anglican Catholicism—as Mr. Ewer would pompously dignify the Church of England—or Greek Catholicism. (We trust the reader will pardon the use of these self-contradictory appellations, as we only employ them to represent fairly Mr. Ewer. They are themselves a keen satire on his pretensions to Catholicity.) In the union of these three, our sermonizer would realize his best conception of “the holy Catholic Church.” We are bold to say that, in comparison with any or all of them, Protestantism is *not* a failure.

Protestantism has “failed to reach the masses.” True. But what of the “Anglican branch of the one great Church”? Mr. Ewer is constrained to admit that it “has no more succeeded with the masses than has Protestantism.” And what of the Roman Church? “The masses” are “reached” by her, it is true; but reached to be held in ignorant vassalage to priestly authority, and in political and moral degradation. True, Mr. Ewer says to a certain respondent who denied that Romanism reaches the masses, “He has, perhaps, forgotten that when the mob raged through our streets, defying all the power of our police and soldiery, the lifted finger of the archbishop calmed and dispersed it in an hour.” Arch satirist! could he more seriously thrust the Romanists under the fifth rib? Who were this “mob,” which the lifted finger of the archbishop could calm, but the very “masses” of the Roman Church—the *legitimate product of her doctrines and her sacraments*—prompted to these deeds of diabolical fury and outrage by the very ignorance and superstition in which the Church had reared them. Romanism reaching the masses, forsooth!

And what has the Greek Church done with the masses, that it numbers fewer than Protestantism to-day? Indeed, on the score of

success in dealing with men, Protestantism, in three hundred years, numbers one hundred millions, while the Greek Church, in eight hundred years, numbers but about eighty millions, and the Roman Church in twelve hundred years, or, according to her own pretensions, in eighteen hundred years, backed, too, for the larger portion of the time by the thrones of Christendom, numbers but one hundred and ninety-five millions.

Protestantism is "prolific of sects." True. But wherein is it worse than the Catholicism of which Mr. Ewer boasts? Look at his Anglican Church, with all the power of the English throne, and all the patronage of the British Government to maintain and enforce its claims; yet surrounded and almost overwhelmed with the numerous sects which have sprung out of its bosom! To-day the power of these sects is so overshadowing, that the State Church exists only by sufferance, and quakes with fear of utter overthrow. Our author has himself given a list of nearly *two hundred* sects that afflicted the Church before Protestantism was born, and adds: "Surely sectarianism has tried often enough to found a lasting form of the Church." We reply: Surely the so-called Catholic Church has tried often enough to kill sectarianism! With such a brood of vipers crawling from her bosom, it ill becomes any of her champions to taunt Protestants with the number of their sects. Even this triune Catholic Church for which our author contends—the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican—for the Roman is Catholic, and the Greek is Catholic, and the Anglican is Catholic, and these are not three Catholics, but one Catholic—even this trinity of Catholic Churches can not "agree in one." They have no fellowship with each other. Every effort to patch up a union between the Roman and Greek Churches has failed. The Greek Patriarch has recently snubbed the Roman Pope in his haughty rejection of the invitation to attend the coming ecumenical council. The English bishops have done the same. On the other hand, Rome treats these schismatics as unfit to be recognized until they return in sackcloth and ashes, and acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope. Mr. Ewer's plea for Catholicity is met with a storm of ridicule from the Roman camp. Yet these three unreconciled and irreconcilable bodies, without the least recognition of each other, or the slightest intercommunion, are held forth as the divine pattern of Catholicity, to the confusion of Protestant sects, which, to say the least, generally

acknowledge each other, and interchange many friendly tokens of Christian regard and sympathy!

Protestantism "ends in rationalism and infidelity." And have no rationalists and infidels come forth from the Anglican and Roman Churches? Is it needful to do more than mention France and Italy, or more than name Colenso and the authors of the celebrated "Essays and Reviews"? There is this to be said of the difference between Protestants and these so-called Catholics in reference to rationalists and infidels. Among the former, doubt springs from the freedom of investigation; and, whatever may be the temporary aberrations or eccentricities of free and enlightened mind, they are more tolerable and more hopeful than that utter stagnation of intellect and blind slavery to authority which, among the Catholics, is the fearful price paid for faith—a dumb, deaf, blind faith, which fails to rise to the dignity of intelligence, and falls below God-implanted animal instincts; while, among the latter, unbelief is the desperate revolt of the rational nature against the intolerable absurdities, mummeries, corruptions, and tyranny of the Church. The former may be won back by purer light; the latter, if not hopelessly alienated, must be won to something else than that which they have renounced. In fact, our author admits that "Romanism has also made infidels in Italy and France." How, then, is Protestantism a failure, on this score, more than Romanism?

This term "Protestantism" is not altogether definite. It is used, sometimes, in a semi-philosophical and semi-political sense, as descriptive of the soul's protest against human sovereignty over the conscience, and as affirming, broadly and resolutely, the responsibility of man to God alone for his convictions. In this sense, pretty much all rationalists, and infidels, and skeptics, of whatever hue or grade, are Protestants quite as much as believers in the Bible, and the latter contend for Protestant principles quite as much for the benefit of the former as for their own advantage; since the doubter and the unbeliever have an equal right with the believer to their own convictions. But, again, we use the term Protestantism in an ecclesiastical or religious sense, to describe that portion of those who protest against the tyranny of the Church of Rome, who, while acknowledging God as alone Lord of the conscience, acknowledge the Bible as revealing the will of God, and its perfection as a rule of faith and

a law of right. This we take to be the current meaning of the word, and, in this sense, Protestantism is no more responsible for the rationalism of to-day than were the apostles for the treachery of Judas, or the primitive Church for the malice of Alexander the coppersmith, or the arrogance of Diotrephes.

Now, in the former sense, Protestantism is by no means a failure. The might of her principles and the growth of her empire are steadily increasing. She not only emancipated several of the nations of Europe from a terrible ecclesiastical thralldom, but gave birth to ideas and principles whose regenerative and revolutionary power has never ceased to be felt. It has smitten to the dust the divine right of kings as well as of pontiffs; it has stripped Church and State of arrogant claims, and exalted the individual man to a sacredness which formerly belonged only to orders and castes; it has overthrown slavery, alike of soul and body; it has led the nations under its control along the paths of reformation, evermore to new conflicts and new triumphs, until a thousand hoary and oppressive errors, once worshiped, are forever accursed; it has liberalized governments; purged jurisprudence of many absurdities and wrongs; revolutionized science; nursed the practical arts into prodigious growth, and built up empires of a nobler and completer civilization than the world ever saw before. And these same principles are working mightily, even now, for the final overthrow of the political and ecclesiastical despotisms of which the Roman Catholic Church is the champion. Austria, Hungary, Italy, Spain, are, in the mighty revolutions now going on, glorious witnesses that Protestantism is not a failure. Our own glorious land, with her matchless treasures of freedom, education, and popular sovereignty, sends out a testimony to the vitality and integrity of Protestantism whose luster reaches to the ends of the earth—whose voice echoes with quickening power among the oppressed of all lands. It is madness to stand in this Protestant land, in the enjoyment of Protestant liberties, and proclaim Protestantism a failure—all the while indebted to that very Protestantism for the right of making the proclamation! Let Mr. Ewer go to Rome, to his beloved Roman branch of the Catholic Church, and presume to preach that Romanism is a failure, and he will get such a taste of the sweets of Catholicity as will prevail, much sooner than any other logic, to rectify his judgment.

But this reverend champion of Catholicity, knowing the force of such a simple statement of facts, has done his best to break it. We submit a quotation to this effect:

"The real cause of the light and advance of modern times is not a theological dogma, but it is a general awakening of mind which began far back in the middle ages, four hundred years before the Protestant dogma was ever thought of—an awakening of mind, of taste, of the genius of invention, which, abandoning the rude structures of the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, brought out, long before the Continental Reformation, the most ornate specimens of architecture the world ever saw; which, in the eleventh century, invented paper, and, before John Calvin and Martin Luther ever saw the light, produced the art of printing—paper and printing, the two conservers of human intelligence; which, in the twelfth century, devised banks of exchange and discount, and not long after invented gunpowder; conceived the idea of the post-office, and discovered and applied the principle of magnetism in the mariner's compass, thus giving such a start to commerce and magnificent geographical discovery as they had never had before; which, in the tenth century, contrived clocks; which invented painting in oil colors before Luther was born; which, in the thirteenth century, introduced astronomy and geometry into Europe, and not long after brought in algebra, and fostered all three sciences; which discovered America a quarter of a century before the Continental "Reformation," so-called, opened; which, centuries before Luther, produced a Dante, and a Petrarca, and a Chaucer, and a Boccaccio, and a Roger Bacon—Roger Bacon, who, three centuries before his successor, Lord Francis Bacon, announced to the world the very method of legitimate investigation, in accordance with which all modern science is pursued, and upon which Lord Bacon afterward built his fame—Roger Bacon, of the so-called dark ages, who had this immense advantage over the Bacon of the sixteenth century, in that he personally put his method into practice. . . . Protestantism was but one of the effects of the general awakening of mind, not its cause; and our charge is, that it happened to be one of the bad effects—not in that it struck at Roman error, but because it sought to destroy Catholic truth also."

Now, without pausing to dispute the fairness of any of these statements, we beg leave to say that the difficulty is not met, but evaded. It is not claimed that Protestantism is the source of all the progress of modern times, or that all men were but savages and slaves before Martin Luther appeared; but it *is* claimed that the Roman Catholic Church, having all the advantages of this "general awakening of mind" before Protestantism was born, and possessed of all facilities for turning it to the world's advantage, has, in spite of this general awakening, thrown herself across the path of progress, clinging to the superstitions and tyrannies of the past, so that her sway, even to this day, holds nations in ignorance and slavery; while Protestantism has availed herself of this awakening of mind, and

helped it on, and has led the van of the hosts of freedom, and reared up the freest, most intelligent, and most progressive of the nations of the earth. We know that her course has been marked, at times, by great follies and wrongs. We know that the history of the Roman Catholic Church is not destitute of noble deeds and admirable achievements. We know, too, that in the main, the Roman Catholic Church has clutched, and even now clutches, the most odious doctrines of despotism, and clings to them as tenaciously in the person of Pius IX as she clung to them in that of Gregory VII, while Protestantism champions the cause of freedom, and fills the lands where she reigns with the blessings of civil and religious liberty. Why did not the "general awakening of mind" make the Spain, and Italy, and Austria of to-day better rather than worse than the Spain, Italy, and Austria of the past? Why has Spain sunken into imbecility? Why has France been deluged with the horrors of infidelity, and crushed by the iron heel of despotism? Why has Austria lost her prestige? Why the everlasting succession of crimes and horrors in Mexican and South American governments? How comes it that "the general awakening of mind" has brought these children of the Church no boon—while Great Britain, Prussia, and the United States have grown into their present grand proportions and conquering power? We repeat it, the difficulty is not met. Our author makes a plausible attempt to bewitch his readers into forgetfulness of the true issue, but he has certainly failed to show that Protestantism is a failure in the sense in which we have been using the term.

But when we come to the *religious* sense of the word, Protestantism *has* proved, so far, a failure; not a failure viewed relatively to the Greek or Roman Churches, but a failure in view of the work she undertook to accomplish. Her task was: a restoration of primitive Christianity; a re-enthronement of Christ in the hearts of the people as the only Lord; a re-assertion of the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice; the overthrow of popish and priestly authority, and the re-establishment of the universal priesthood of believers; a forsaking of all humanly-appointed rites and doctrines, and a return to the purity and simplicity of the primitive worship.

That it was a grand design none acquainted with the abominable

assumptions of Popery can doubt. That it has failed of entire success may be accounted for in reasonable ways, but that it *has* failed of complete success is patent to all who are cognizant of the present state of Protestant Christendom. As a state religion it has degenerated into formalism, ritualism, profligacy, hypocrisy, corruption, and intolerance, until it is scarcely better than that which it supplanted. It exalted *orthodoxy* at the expense of *character*, until soundness of doctrine was every thing, and purity of life nothing; and this necessarily gave birth to a reactionary pietism and mysticism, which, in its turn, produced the reaction of Rationalism, and thus the whole work has been terribly marred. In its best estate, in our own land, where it is happily freed from the corrupting touch of politicians, it is yet destitute of the grand features of the primitive faith—*simplicity, purity, unity, catholicity*. We have no desire to exaggerate the errors of Protestantism. We are anxious to see and appreciate all that is redeeming in it. We do not sympathize with Mr. Ewer in the eagerness and delight with which he presses every unfavorable fact into his service. Yet many of his statements are too sadly true. Read the following:

"The successors of the very magistrates who condemned Servetus, of the pastors who excommunicated him as the denier of the Trinity, now themselves unite in rejecting that doctrine. The faith of the great Churches of Geneva is Unitarianism. The system of John Calvin is almost extinct in the town where he was once the spiritual tyrant. There are believers in the divinity of our blessed Lord Jesus existing in Geneva, it is true, *who are divided into several parties*, but the national Church of Geneva is Unitarian. The number of inhabitants in Geneva amounts to about 64,000; among them are about 40,000 Unitarians, 18,000 Roman Catholics, and the miserable balance only are left to Protestant Trinitarianism."

His picture of New England's spiritual degeneracy; the testimony produced from Mr. Moody, of Chicago, that "city missions had proved failures on the ground that the wrangling among the different sects prevented the creation of permanent congregations from the converts made;" the numerous confessions gathered up from leading Protestants of the utter inefficiency of Protestant agencies to reach the masses of the people; his too faithful sketch of Protestant Germany and Switzerland—all these may well call the intelligent Protestant to pause and inquire candidly whether Protestantism is not a failure.

The following indictments against Protestantism, with its numerous and terrible counts, while it is falsely used by our author, is, nevertheless, worthy of careful and candid consideration :

"Its intolerance began in that violent man, Luther, a man who uttered such language concerning most sacred things as can not be repeated to ears polite. It continued in Calvin, than whom a more tyrannical spirit can hardly be conceived. It slew Mary, Queen of Scots, Strafford and Laud, and martyred Charles the First. It went in the Puritans to Holland, and was so cross-grained there, that when it sailed away the Dutchmen praised God for the merciful deliverance. It took ship and threatened to come to New York, and would have landed here had not the citizens found means to bribe the captain of the *Mayflower* to land his uncomfortable freight by mistake somewhere else. In Cromwell it would not be content to enjoy its own Congregationalism quietly ; no, but it broke into the Church of England ; it stripped off the garments from our clergy ; with axes and hammers it broke down our carved work ; [there is an immense proportion of genuine religion in 'garments' and 'carved work' in the estimation of Mr. Ewer ;] it hanged witches ; it drove out Roger Williams from its settlements into the inhospitable forests of Rhode Island, for the liberty of belief which he claimed ; in the Quakers it would not be content to enjoy silent meetings, but must go in and disturb the Puritan meetings, with not only violent but indecent behavior, and then turning round, in the Puritans it hanged the Quakers ; in the eighteenth century it pelted John Wesley through the streets, and broke up his meetings ; in the nineteenth century it mobs our priests while at their solemn services in the east of London, and, as for our sisters of Mercy, for the crime those gentlewomen have been guilty of in devoting themselves to lives of charity and prayer, to watchings in pestilential hospitals, it attacks them in the streets with missiles until they fly for their lives."

We are well aware that it is only by a contemptible style of pettifoggery that many of these counts can be sustained so as to prove what our author wishes to prove. We know full well that the intelligent student of history will at once detect an uncandid spirit and a partisan purpose in this presentment. Yet there is sufficient truth in it to show that Protestants did not readily rid themselves of the persecuting intolerance inbreathed from the Roman Catholic Church in which they had been reared, and taught anew to the Puritans by the Anglican Church, from whose violent hand they sped across the ocean to the American wilderness. Our author is so enamored of the sanctity of the "Roman branch of the Catholic Church," that he can not even represent it in a pronoun without a capital letter : it is "She," or "Her," or "It." Yet this magnificent and holy "She" is "drunk with the blood of saints ;" and not the space of Mr. Ewer's sermons would suffice for the indictment against "Her." His own

Anglican branch was guilty of enormous wrongs against dissenters, for which it is no wonder if, when they had the chance, they stripped the "garments" from her clergy and defaced her "carved work." It comes with an ill grace, therefore, from this advocate of bloody ecclesiasticisms, to parade the intolerance of Protestants. Still, to us, there is significance in these unwelcome facts; and when, to all the discouraging facts presented, we add the startling one that *Protestantism is making no new conquests*, while Popery is, in our land, gaining on her, and Rationalism is draining away much of her strength, we are compelled to the conclusion that, however great and incalculable the benefits conferred on humanity by the revolutionary power of this protest against tyranny, it has failed to re-establish Christianity.

It is time to say that with the avowed object of Mr. Ewer we fully sympathize:

"We have stated that the Roman Catholic Church is a failure in so far as she is Roman. We set up Catholicity for the cure, not Rome. But the difficulty with these men is, that they do not seem to comprehend that there is any other kind of Christianity except Protestantism and Romanism; and they think that, if we say Protestantism fails, we mean, of course, that every body should take to Rome. They do not comprehend that there is a third presentment of Christianity, namely, Catholicity, with nothing distinctively Roman in it, and nothing distinctively 'Protestant' either. *The fact is, that, what with Rome and what with Protestantism, God's old Catholicity has been under a cloud, and has not gained the general ear of the people in America.* . . . There are thousands of men left outside the walls of any faith, who can not accept Protestantism, which they have shaken off, who will not surrender their proper freedom of thought to Rome, but who are craving for a faith of some kind, for a Christianity with reality, robustness, and common sense in it."

In all this we fully concur; and to this conclusion all candid Protestants must come at last. It only remains to ascertain what this "Catholicity" is, and where it is to be found, and the task is complete. Let us hear our valorous preacher on this most interesting point. He seeks to locate Catholicity in what he calls the three branches of the Catholic Church—the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican; and inquires:

"What faith is it, then, that they all hold in common? Not the thirty-nine articles, for they are merely Anglican; not the Tridentine decrees, for they are merely Roman; not the decrees of the Synod of Bethlehem, for they are merely Greek; but the faith as set forth by those great Councils wherein all three took part, wherein the whole Church spoke—the faith, namely, known as the Niceno-Con-

stantinopolitan Creed, which all three to-day accept, and which the whole Church has from the first accepted, even before those Councils set that faith in the framework of words."

And this is "God's Catholicity"! We ask for bread, and Mr. Ewer gives us a stone; for fish, and he gives us a serpent. We ask to be carried back to the pure fountain of "God's Catholicity," and he lands us three or four hundred years down the stream, amidst muddy and turbulent waters, polluted by Grecian philosophy, by Jewish ritualism, and by the carnal ambition of ecclesiastics whose growing power has led them into utter forgetfulness of the humility and spirituality of the primitive pastors of the Church of God. Even in the Apostles' time "the mystery of iniquity did already work," and men of perverse minds sought to draw away disciples after them. That this apostasy was to grow into fearful dimensions as soon as the restraining power of Pagan Rome should be withdrawn, we have Paul for a witness. Yet this advocate of "God's Catholicity" would land us where this "Man of Sin" is in the full bloom of his apostasy, and bid us behold, in this magnificent "deceivableness of unrighteousness," the Catholicity we are pining for! It will not do, Mr. Ewer. The "thousands" who are waiting "outside of Protestantism and Romanism," and craving a "Christianity with reality, robustness, and common sense in it," are not to be deceived with the gilded pomp and "lying wonders" of the apostate Church to which they are pointed. They are men of intelligence. They have read Isaac Taylor's "Ancient Christianity," and kindred works; they know the pious frauds, monkish asceticisms, ritualistic superstitions, sacramental extravagances, philosophical absurdities, and ecclesiastical assumptions of that period too well to be duped into the acceptance of this as the primitive Catholicity. Why this anxiety to obscure the "old paths," this hesitancy to ascend the stream until the original fountain is reached, "the pure river of the water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb"? Was there not a Gospel, uncorrupted by device of men—a Church, divinely planted, and constructed "according to the pattern shown in the mount," a "Catholicity" that was indeed "God's," being his own uncorrupted idea of a spiritual brotherhood meant to include "all nations, and kindreds, and tongues" in "one body," with "one Spirit," under "one Lord," inspired by "one faith" and "one hope," gathered

in by "one baptism," and loving and serving "one God and Father of all"?

Here we part company with Mr. Ewer, and with pretty much all Protestants, and bring forward the distinctive plea of the present Reformation—a *bona fide return to the Christianity of the New Testament, in letter and in spirit, in principle and in practice*—to Christianity as it was before the apostasy, as revealed by the Holy Spirit, and taught by the Apostles.

Let us sketch, very briefly, some of the prominent features of Primitive Christianity which Protestantism has failed to restore:

- I. The Simplicity of its Creed.
- II. The Spirituality of its Membership.
- III. Its Unity.
- IV. Its Catholicity.

I. Nothing is more remarkable in the Christianity of the New Testament than *the simplicity of its creed*. Protestants are apt to talk of "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," as their creed, yet they were never daring enough to carry this into practical effect. But this was not the original creed, for the whole Bible was not yet written, and that part which was written—the Old Testament—was not known to the generality of Gentile converts. Yet there was "one faith" which all were called to possess, without which none could enter the Church, and the possession of which was a certain passport at the portals of the spiritual temple. "JESUS IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD," was the original creed of Christianity—"the Apostles' creed"—for that which is generally styled such is confessedly spurious. *The Divinity and the Messiahship of Jesus*; this was the creed: the only creed to which assent was required in order to baptism and membership in the Church. This was uniformly required of Jew and Gentile. In becoming Christians they renounced all other lords, all other saviors, but Jesus, and gave to him, in baptism, their covenant pledge of trust, love, and service; and the only condition of fellowship in the Church was *loyalty to Jesus*, obedience to his laws as taught and enjoined by the Apostles. All who, trusting in the Son of God for salvation, were immersed by his authority into the names of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and continued patiently to keep his commandments, were "one in Christ Jesus;" whether male or female, rich or poor,

Jew, Barbarian, Scythian, bond or free, they were "brethren," members of one holy, spiritual brotherhood, and heirs of eternal life. Outside of this faith and obedience they had no dominion over each other. No amount of difference of opinion, or habit, of race, or of former religious training, no amount of error even, was allowed to break the bonds of this fellowship so long as its members clung to faith in the Christ, and willing obedience to his precepts and ordinances. In all else, every individual was responsible only to God and to that law of Christian love which required that he should not use his liberty in a way to cause others to stumble.

Here is a basis—a *divine* basis—for unity and Catholicity. To build up a spiritual brotherhood out of all nations, the creed must be simple, the terms of fellowship divine in their authority. The Primitive Church did establish unity and Catholicity on this basis; it has never been effected since on any other basis. A departure from the primitive creed was the introduction of parties and sects, and with the growth of human creeds and human tests of fellowship has been the growth of sects and of the mischiefs of sectarianism. The reader of ecclesiastical history can not fail to notice in what is called the Apostles' creed, then in the Nicene, then in the Athanasian, how this departure from the simplicity of the original creed grew into an enormous apostasy, and how the "frame-work of words" in which men sought to express what God had never authorized to be expressed, became a shibboleth of party, and filled the Christian community with bitter and bloody strife.

Protestantism never returned to this simple creed. Protestant leaders had not faith enough to trust the soul and the conscience alone with Christ. Human creeds, abounding in speculative doctrines unknown to the Bible, and in ecclesiastical inventions and ordinations entirely of human origin, were fastened on the people; and the effect, from that day to this, has been to hold emancipated and progressive natures to standards of the past. If they outgrew them, they must protest and secede, and establish a new creed or a new interpretation of the old one, and in their turn give birth to other secessions and other creeds, and so on *ad infinitum*. There never was a greater imposition on the credulity of men than the pretension that these human creeds are faithful exponents of the faith and practice of those who subscribe to them. From the Augsburg Confession down, their

teachings and interpretations have been constantly in dispute. It has been gravely doubted by an eminent divine of the present time, whether in his "branch" of the Church there is even one minister who believes the entire creed. That the attempt to enforce human creeds has constantly increased the number of sects and the severity of strife, until Protestants seem hopeless and helpless in their endless diversities, is a melancholy fact that does not need to be argued or proved here. *The great mass of Protestants are a unit to-day in the original creed of Christianity, but in nothing else.* Offer them union in the acknowledgment of a Divine Savior, and they will flow together like kindred drops of water. Here alone, so far as creed is concerned, is union possible. The responsibility of division and of the consequent failure of Protestantism rests with those who insist on these unauthorized and mischievous standards.

Observe: we are not writing against such statements of doctrine or practice as may be necessary to cause a movement or a people to be understood in its distinctive features; nor against human vindications of divine truth, such as the age or the circumstances may demand; but *against making these authoritative* as undisputed standards of truth.

II. The *Spirituality* of the Primitive Church is another feature which Protestantism has failed to reproduce. For this there are two reasons:

1. The Primitive Church received none to membership but *willing confessors*. The Church was made up of professed believers, who came voluntarily within her pale, and there was little inducement, other than spiritual good, to draw them. It was, therefore, in a high sense, a spiritual brotherhood. But Protestantism has, most absurdly, clung with the utmost tenacity to that "relic of Popery," infant membership; a fruitful source of carnality, inasmuch as it supplies the Church by generation rather than by regeneration; and, to the extent to which it obtains, obliterates the distinction between the Church and the world, fosters the unhallowed union of Church and State, and subjects the Church's movements to considerations of State policy, the ambition or caprice of despots, and the intrigues of courtiers.

That Protestantism has been false to her own principles in this is evident when we consider that infant membership is unsupported

by precept or example in the New Testament ; that it was imported into Protestant Churches from the Roman Catholics ; and that the latter make it rest for authority on that very tradition which Protestants repudiate.

The extent to which the spirituality of the Church has been sacrificed by this human tradition can never be estimated. A single fact may aid us somewhat to appreciate it. Good old Richard Baxter stands among the most eminent pastors of his time, alike in the searching character of his preaching, and in the laboriousness of his life among the people of his charge. We look, therefore, to Kidderminster for a favorable exhibition of the spirituality of pedobaptism. That he did his best to make it as spiritual as possible, none will doubt who know of his life and character. Let this brief sentence tell the story :

"And so, for fear of discipline, all the parish kept off (from the Lord's Supper) except about six hundred, *when there were in all above sixteen hundred at an age to be communicants.*" (Life and Times, i, 118.)

Here are a thousand out of sixteen hundred *members of the Church* held back, because of scandalous living, from the Lord's Supper, by the purity and zeal of a preëminently godly man ! We leave the reader to reach his own conclusions as to the amount of spirituality to be expected, generally, in Churches supplied with members from the cradle, and, in State Churches, generally under the care of an ease-loving and carnal ministry.

2. The Primitive Church was in direct and positive antagonism with the world, and relied solely on spiritual forces for success. Protestantism has been allied with the State, and has been subjected to the embarrassments and corruptions growing out of State patronage and State control. That this has emasculated the faith and holiness of the Protestant Churches is beyond all question, and that Rationalism and Infidelity have been engendered and fostered by the formalism and corruption thus created, rather than by radical defects in Protestant principles, is to us equally clear. The creeds of Protestantism, too, and her ecclesiastical polities, have been largely shaped under the dictation of kings, cabinets, and parliaments ; and, as the world learns more of the corrupt and disgusting history of royal duplicities, cabinet intrigues, and parliamentary management, they learn to reject with scorn, as bonds of spiritual fellowship, or as forms of

acceptable worship, the creeds, and rituals, and ecclesiastical polities which were framed to suit politicians or promote the cherished schemes of ambitious kings. We need only refer to the considerations of policy which gave shape to the doctrine, ritual, and ecclesiastical polity of the Church of England, resulting in "a Calvinistic creed, a Popish liturgy, and an Arminian clergy;" and to the Westminster Confession, framed by men appointed by Parliament, and only adopted as it pleased Parliament to approve it. It surely is not strange that the present generation has outgrown *such* creeds, or that men should crave something having "more reality, robustness, and common sense" in it.

Of course, if the simplicity of faith and spirituality of the Primitive Church are wanting, we shall look in vain for her unity or her Catholicity. Hence, Protestantism is, in all these respects, a failure. Protestants must consent to see this, to acknowledge it, to abandon their errors, and make a complete return to the Christianity of the New Testament, or their failure will, in the next half century, become hopelessly apparent.

This is our plea before the whole Protestant world. We see in it, not only the possibility, but the certainty of that unity and Catholicity which creed-distracted Protestantism has utterly failed to reach. It seems like a bold venture, we are aware, to ignore a hundred heresies, and attempt to unite variant and discordant minds in a simple faith such as the Gospel announces; but it is scarcely bolder than the original work of Protestantism in knocking the shackles from the soul, and teaching men to think for themselves. Moreover, *it is divine*, and, therefore, safe and right. The flowing together of millions in such a divinely simple and beautiful faith would generate a spiritual enthusiasm in whose fires a thousand differences would be consumed; and in the gigantic moral triumphs growing out of such a union, with only Christ to plead for, and only his work of love to engage us, we should forget forever all former strifes, and blush to think that we had ever been divided. Then, indeed, it would appear, that, however Protestantism may be regarded as a failure, Christianity is not a failure. Her simple creed, her Divine Lord, her united hosts, her pure spirituality, her world-embracing benevolence, her heaven-born peace and harmony, her heavenly hopes and inspirations, would flood the earth with light and love, until the assumptions of Popery,

the cold, proud pretensions of Rationalism, the superstitions of heathenism, and the cruelties, and wrongs, and disorders of a world where sin so long has reigned, should retire confounded before the glory of the Church of God, and "the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." Who, to hasten that day, would not yield party name and party creed, and be simply a disciple of Jesus?

We do not hesitate to avow the conviction that this world can never be regenerated only as Jesus, the Son of Mary and the Son of God, our blessed Mediator, shall become a living power in the hearts of men, through faith, to reunite them to God. No philosophy, no political management, no social science, no ritual, no human creed can accomplish this work. It must be a power within, not without; in the heart, not in the head; supernatural and divine, not rationalistic, ritualistic, or theological; it must be "Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God;" Christ the Savior, Christ the Brother, Christ the Lord, Christ the Hope of Glory. In this there is power to illuminate, purify, and regenerate human nature; and what more do we want to preach to the world, or to unite us in the holiest and lovingest of fellowships? Then let us lose all in Christ Jesus. Let party names drop. Let party creeds be forgotten. Let theological and metaphysical controversies be remanded to the schools where they belong. Let denominational interests be abandoned. Let Christ be "all in all." To Him be glory and dominion forever and ever.

II.—THE LIVING ISSUE.

THE movements of religious thought, in this country, in the nineteenth century, exhibit some of the most interesting and remarkable features to be found in the history of Christianity. The unsolved problems which past ages had transmitted to this, the number of master intellects engaged in their solution, the immense advance in all departments of knowledge, affording vastly increased facilities for the investigation of such questions, and all this coming at a time when an enlarged measure of political freedom made it possible for men to use their advantages, have contributed to make these movements among the most interesting in the history of the world. It is, in a great measure, true that each age is unconscious of what it is doing. A far-seeing mind, here and there, may have some glimpses of the far-off results of present processes; but the great majority of mankind must expend what force they have upon subordinate questions. Yet, when the logic of events has pronounced a conclusion, those who live at the time and comprehend it, have the "master light" which explains all the steps in its previous progress. We venture to think the age in which we live is such a time. The utterances of the present are explaining the mental struggles of the past. When we go back half a century, and look upon the controversies then in progress, we see a multitude of questions in the crucible of denominational experiment; and if we examine the effect produced by the ordeal upon contemporary thought, we find the minds of men bewildered by the scene of antagonism and confusion; but, if viewed from the point at which we now stand, when nearly twenty years of the last half of our century have gone, we discover that the great spirit of order which presides over and directs the world of mind, as well as that of nature, has brought out clearly into the field of vision two grand results, to which it is the object of this paper to invite the attention of the reader.

To do this intelligently, it will be necessary to review briefly the nature of the movement.

In the great mental conflicts of past ages, we recognize, first

of all, the deep longing of the spirit of man for repose, on the grounds of ultimate and universal truth. The human mind has never ceased to struggle for the discovery of propositions by which such grounds might be expressed. The largest part of the history of philosophy is but the record of the effort to find a method that might with certainty lead to this end, while the saddest cry of the human heart has come from its feeling of unrest when returning from its long and painful search unsatisfied and disappointed. The civilization in which Christianity, when it came, was planted, was created by the struggles of the intellect to discover the grounds of ultimate truth; hence, the type of mind which it encountered was ready to convert, or, rather, pervert, the simple and sublime truth left in the world by Jesus and his apostles into a means for pursuing its investigations. This led to that form of religious thought which we now wish to notice. Very early in the history of Christianity, religious dogmatism became the life of the Church. Whoever has glanced at the time which succeeded the apostolic age knows that the subjects of greatest interest had already become the truth or falsity of doctrine. Religious dogmas had begun to take the place in the intellectual world which philosophical dogmas had occupied through many preceding centuries. We do not travel far from the death of the last apostle until we find society convulsed by the collisions of religious opinion. The earliest writers against the Christian religion were enabled to reproach its disciples with their bitter and disgraceful quarrels. Before Rome had united to herself the political supremacy of the empire, there was remaining sufficient freedom for debate, and the distractions of the Church, produced by opposing doctrines, advocated by different eminent leaders, make up most of the history of the period. After her organization had matured sufficiently to enable her to interpose her authority, she began to settle authoritatively the dogmas which should form the belief of Christendom. The history of ecumenical councils affords the amplest materials for illustrating the point now before us, namely: that the great purpose of the intellectual life of the Christian world was, through many centuries, to determine which doctrines men should believe, and which they should not. It is no exaggeration to affirm that for more than fifteen hundred years of the Christian era, the object regarded as the worthiest of all thought was, to settle finally the subject

of doctrines. The places occupied in religious literature by the words orthodox and heterodox will stand in all times as a full demonstration of the position, if any is needed.

If we now examine the great Protestant movements we shall find the human mind still expecting repose in the doctrines of a creed. Luther comes before the world on a system of dogmas. The power which revolutionized the mind of Europe in the sixteenth century was a series of controversies on the subject of doctrines. It is not necessary here to state the particular dogmas upon which each of the great Protestant parties have successively, from Luther down to the present time, claimed the dominion of the human mind. The point now before us is the historical fact that the claim of each is based upon the assumption that its system of dogmas should form the ground of human belief. We do not forget the fact that these movements were each, in its own time, the best and largest measure of truth possible to men. We do not wish to forget that the great men whose names history will associate with them forever were among the truest workers for humanity; nor, that the issues upon which they have come successively before the world have formed the steps in the progress of all our civilization. All this, however, does not in the smallest degree change the position which we are considering, namely: that the religious life of Christendom, to the beginning of the nineteenth century, was a life of dogmatism. To this hour, underlying the Roman Catholic Church and every Protestant party, is its dogmatic statement of doctrines, which gives to each its organization; its form of worship; its denominational spirit; and its intellectual life. The human mind is still seeking the place of repose for which it has been struggling through the ages, and, to a large extent, in the circle of both Romanism and Protestantism, still expecting to find it in the propositions of a creed.

Now, in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, there sprang up a movement wholly different in spirit and purpose from any of those to which we have referred. While creeds had it in their power to open to the mind of man wider views of truth, and to bring him larger measures of freedom than he had before, they followed each other as we have them in history; but the time had come when they had given to humanity all they had to give, and, as in the case of all obsolete forms of thought in the onward march of mind, they

became dead bodies lying in the pathway of human progress. This fact is the ground of the reaction which is now about to engage our attention. Dogmatism had produced its ripe fruit. Partyism in religion had narrowed the life of Protestantism into mental servility and bitterness. Large-minded and honest-hearted men, repelled by the untruthfulness of party spirit, and unfed by its lifeless dogmatism, were driven into antagonism to all formulas of doctrine outside of the Bible. The issue was no longer which were to be accepted and which rejected, but an unqualified rejection of all dogmatic statements of doctrine as such. While the revolt of the human mind against the tyranny of ecclesiastical dogmatism had occurred many times before—while those revulsions had marked some of the greatest changes human society has experienced—in no instance has it taken the same form, and led to the same results, as in this. The English, in the first half of the eighteenth century, failing to discriminate between the simple apostolic Christianity of the New Testament and the forms of Church life which had become so repulsive to them, in rejecting the one, rejected also the other, and, having nothing else to fall back upon but the prevailing philosophy of the time, were driven into Deism. In the last half of the same century a similar revulsion of the French mind ended in Atheism; and about the close of the century and the beginning of this, German thinkers had reached modern Rationalism. In America, under a wiser guidance, the reaction was to the New Testament. A feature of religious controversy unknown in the history of Christianity appeared. An issue which had not challenged the human mind since the apostolic age was now made and pressed with great force by the men who led the movement. The position that the teachings of Jesus and the apostles is the only creed of Christians, and the only ground of Scriptural ecclesiasticism, became at once the point against which every Protestant party directed the whole measure of its power for the space of a generation; but, opposition has only revealed its strength. Nearly all of its defenders in the first generation were men who had been trained in the creed Churches. Having embraced a position antagonistic to their former associations, the feeling of hatred which always follows those who leave a partisan organization increased the bitterness of the conflict. But, understanding the vulnerable parts of the systems they had left, they became the most formidable opponents; and now, after a

controversy of about fifty years, it is seen that the progress of the movement has not in the slightest degree been arrested. On the contrary, its present statistics would show that it is moving with a constantly increasing momentum and an accelerated velocity. Besides, its friends believe they see in the tendencies of the spirit of the age a guarantee of still more splendid triumphs in the future. Here then, in this new issue, the Bible against creeds, with the causes which led to it, we recognize the most remarkable phenomenon of religious thought in the first half of the nineteenth century in this country; and, in its success, we wish to emphasize the first of the two grand results mentioned at the beginning of this article. This, however, has been but the negative side of the movement. It has also its positive side, to which the first was but the introduction. In this will be found to reside the secret of its power. It will not be difficult to understand how one has inevitably developed from the other. Having, in the reaction from creeds, been driven to the Bible, the first question was to ascertain the true use of its teachings. It had already been decided that it was not given to men to be, by them, formulated into creeds; and, once in this position, the consciousness of the spirit's needs and its unsatisfied cravings soon accomplished the rest. If the "Father of Spirits" in giving to men his Word, regarded their deepest wants, then he meant, by that Word, to lead the world to Christ. The craving of the heart is for life, of the mind for light, and so we read: "*In him was life, and the life was the light of men.*" But, that this part of the subject may stand before the reader in the light in which we wish him to see it, let us glance at the corresponding movement of unbelief. To follow the revolt of the human mind against the Christian religion through all the forms of its misbelief, disbelief, unbelief, and antibelief, even if we possessed the learning and the genius requisite for such an undertaking, would lead us far beyond our present purpose. A few of the main facts is all that we now need to bring out the position we have in view. Infidelity, in most of its decided attacks, has been compelled, especially in the beginning of its opposition, to take the form given it by the corresponding attitude of Christianity. Hence, the points of its denial have varied frequently in the course of its history. When the aggressive force of the Christian religion was represented by formulas of doctrine, infidelity has begun by a negation of these. It is true, in the end, it has sought to

overthrow the facts upon which it has supposed these dogmas were based, and the form which its opposition to the facts of revelation has taken has generally been guided by the philosophy of the age and country in which the attacks were made. Yet, the objective points of its bitterest hatred have been the dogmatic systems by which they were at first repulsed. One of the most important clues to the philosophy of history will be found in a thorough study of the points of denial by each of the great movements of unbelief. Deism in England, Atheism in France, Rationalism in Germany, present us some remarkable phenomena in this respect. The last of these is that in which our present inquiry is concerned. Rationalism is the name by which the present active opposition to Christianity is expressed. Its history has been so often published that we deem a reference to its general features intelligible without detail. We are concerned, at present, with *the point*, we shall call it, of its denial. It is a truism, the most common now met with, that Infidelity has changed the mode of its attack. It would be more in accordance with the fact to say that it has changed both the manner and the point of its attack. For nearly a generation it has given but the smallest part of its attention to the common dogmas of religious belief. Its subject of investigation has been, and still is, the life of Christ. Intellects, which, in their power and in the extent and variety of their culture, rank among the first in the world, have directed the movement; and it would be strange if, by such minds, nothing was learned from the experience of centuries. Victories had been achieved over the dogmas of creeds which at the time seemed to promise great results. Many which had been supposed to wear the seal of infallibility had been driven almost from the memory of men; and yet, Christianity has lived on. When all the miracles of the four Gospels and the evidences of prophecy had been disposed of, as was supposed, by the widening range of natural law and the ordeal of historical criticism, the highest of all miracles, the life of Christ and the existence of Christianity, still remained. This life, then, must be displaced before another step could be taken in the progress of unbelief. The fountain must be dried up, or the stream will flow forever. This life has two sides, a human and a Divine. He is Jesus of Nazareth in Galilee; and he is the Christ, the Son of the living God. The principles that would destroy the history of Jesus would annihilate the veracity of all

history. This, then, must be admitted. But his claim to be received as the Messiah; what does this mean? It involves his right to be received as the life of the world and the light of men. But this is precisely what unbelief can not receive, and remain unbelief. Thus we find that Rationalism, with the example and the experience of all past forms of unbelief, has narrowed the issue to the denial of the single point, Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. But we have already discovered that the rejection of dogmatic systems as grounds of human belief, and the acceptance of the New Testament as the only guide of men, has led them to the affirmation of this as the fountain of light and life.

But, that we may understand the meaning of this issue, appreciate its magnitude, and see the relation which all parties sustain to it, let us study it from another stand-point. The literature of Rationalism is, to this time, directed to the solution of a single question. That question was asked by the Savior himself. Without any perversion of its meaning, we may conceive it as still being asked, and in the process of being answered. When first propounded, it contemplated two classes of mankind, each having its own answer, Whom MEN said, and whom his *disciples*. Now, if we substitute Rationalists for *men*, in the first, and Protestants and Romanists, professed Christians, for disciples, in the second of these classes, we have the stand-point mentioned. Then, if we consider the living utterances of all men in this generation as their reply to this question, it sinks all others into insignificance. When it is considered that every man's life, by a fixed law of his moral being, takes the form which his conscience gives it, and his conscience, by the same law, receives its type from his faith, since it is true that he thinks, feels, lives as he believes, then it must be seen that the real answer which any honest man renders to this question will determine his whole future. When, therefore, the Son of God demands a reply to the question, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am," he asks a life question, which, whatever may be the answer, is the announcement of the principle on which the life will proceed; that by which the character will be measured when it is complete. It would be impossible, in a paper like this, to represent the answers of individual Rationalists to this question; for, as in the days when Jesus came to Cesarea Philippi, some said one thing and some another, so *men* now differ in their

opinions of Jesus; yet, we may approach near enough to a general reply to answer our present purposes. It is generally admitted that there is a narrow basis of historical truth on the human side of his life. His birth of humble parentage; his life in Galilee; the extraordinary spiritual beauty of his character; his great power as a teacher of moral truth; his violent death at Jerusalem; that he was this, but only this. He died as a man, and sleeps in the tomb as Socrates, Plato, and Seneca sleep. If this be assumed as the true reply to the question, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?" what will be the corresponding life? We may, at least, tell some things which it will not be. Having divested him of his divine authority as a teacher, who will any longer sit at his feet? Having disrobed him of his priesthood, who will bring his heart, however stricken by sin and broken by sorrow, to his altar? Having sealed his tomb forever, who, with Peter and John, will hasten, on the first day of the week, to see the place where the Lord lay, and to have his hopes kindled by angel voices, saying, "He is not here; he is risen"? Having deprived him of his glorified life, who any longer will walk with him to Olivet and see humanity, in him, glorified; going, not downward to the grave, but upward to the sky? Or who, lingering here with these Galileans, amidst the ruins of such a life as this, will any longer find an answer to the angel's question, "Why stand ye gazing up into heaven"? Such is the practical effect of the answer which men are rendering to this question.

We may, now, conceiving the membership of the Catholic and Protestant Churches as his disciples, and the other part of the question, "Whom say ye that I am?" as directly put to them, consider their reply. We class them together because the answer of Catholic and Protestant alike is based upon the same principle. The reply, already anticipated in this essay, has been given, printed, and subscribed before the world. In substance it is this: we say that you are the ground of our theological systems. We have formulated you into these articles of belief; what we say, therefore, may be found in our respective creeds. In these you have the answers which we have given and are still giving to your question, "Whom say ye that I am?" We have no inclination to pain the mind of the reader by quoting from these creeds the decayed and repulsive abstractions which they affirm to represent the nature of Christ. The boldness of the attempt

to put the life of "God manifest in the flesh" into a formula made up by the human mind, excites our amazement in this age. It will be sad enough to think of the practical effects of this answer, as seen in the life of Christendom. Truthfully could these parties say to the Lord Jesus, By these formulas we have been able to gauge with precision the differences of religious opinion. Each party can know exactly how widely the dogmas of the others differ from its own; and when they have cast out as evil the names of those who have failed to see the value or the truth of their doctrines, and have deprived them, as far as possible, of the affection and fellowship of Christian men, they have been able to find their justification in these formulas.

With these facts before us, we may now open the four Gospels and interrogate the teaching of Jesus for the answer which he was seeking when he first asked the question. It will scarcely be called in question, when, from the lives of Christ, written by inspired men, we affirm that he made with mankind *a single issue*. He said to the world, "I am the Christ, the Son of the living God." When the Apostle Peter gave this as the faith of his heart, his confession was immediately crowned with the fullness of Divine approval by the utterance of his own "Blessed art thou;" and then he added, "*This is whom my Father says I am.*" Flesh and blood (men) do not say this, but the Infinite Father does; you have learned this from him." *Jesus must be this to men, or he is nothing.* Before the ages he must stand or fall upon this issue, and this alone. The acceptance of this is the acceptance of all. The denial of this is the denial of all. This, therefore, is incontestably *the living issue* of the age. Jesus says, "I am the Christ;" Rationalism says, he is not. If, now, we inquire what must be the practical result of the answer rendered by the four Gospels to the question, "Whom say ye that I am?" it will be seen at once, and, we think, admitted, by every one who can trace the plainest moral effect to its cause. If an honest man, as a real transaction of the soul, submit his mind to the Great Teacher, to be "taught by him as the truth is in Jesus;" if he bring his heart in the full consciousness of its wants, to the altar of his sacrifice; if he surrender his will to his law as the rule of his life, then this is simply to become a Christian; and this is to receive him as "the Christ, the Son of the living God." Now, let us note the practical effects of the three answers as they are actually being rendered in

the life of the world. The effect of the first, as we have seen, is to make men infidel; of the second, to make them religious partisans; of the third, to make them Christian.

Neither Romanism nor Protestantism has ever made this a distinctive issue with men. Rome, in her very organization, virtually abandoned it, by building upon Peter. Hence, in all her controversies with the world, this issue has scarcely been thought of. The infallibility of the Pope or of the Church, apostolic succession, and the dogmas of councils, have received vastly the largest part of her interest. The Messiahship of Jesus, in the interest which it has elicited, is infinitesimal in comparison with that of the least of her dogmas. When we examine the history of Protestantism, with reference to this question, we find the same fact is equally true. Protestants, in their controversies with Rome and with each other, have thought mostly of their doctrines. It is true, they have not denied the grand issue at which we have been looking; but, it is equally true, they have in no real sense affirmed it. Let any candid mind, after a survey of each of the great Protestant movements, ask himself upon what grounds has it based its claim to the faith of men; which has built itself upon the central question of the four Gospels; which has inscribed it upon its banner; made it the measure of its faith; which has gone before the world to stand or fall upon it; which has required an acknowledgment of it from every man in order to membership; would he not be compelled to say not one, no, not one? Rationalists, numbering among them, as they do, men whose minds have been trained to think by the utmost cultivation, and unincumbered by the defense of authoritative opinions, have, at last, discovered the unguarded part of the fortress, and leaving Romanists and Protestants to watch their unimportant positions, have concentrated their heaviest guns upon this. They have betaken themselves to writing lives of Christ. In the most refined spirit of gentleness and candor, they have thrown around the few facts of his life admitted by them, all the charms of elegant, graceful composition; while the great facts of his history, upon which he claims to be the teacher of man, the high-priest of human nature, and the king from whose law there is no appeal, are either explained away, ignored, or plainly denied. The question that ought to arrest the attention of all sincere men is, Who now is in a position to meet the attack of unbelief?

When it is said that Jesus is not "the Christ, the Son of the living God," who is facing the issue? The mental training which creeds have handed down from generation to generation, impressed by parents as a sacred duty upon the minds of children barely out of the cradle, has inevitably disqualified men for meeting the attack of unbelief in its present form. It has been observed by many writers, and deplored, that both Romanists and Protestants have shown themselves unprepared for the issue as it now stands. They are not even looking toward it. Can any living mind conjecture what the question of the operation of the Holy Spirit without means—the regeneration of infants, or the use of robes and wax candles in reading prayers and brief sermons—has to do with meeting the most cultivated and powerful intellects in Christendom in their attacks on the great vital issue of the Christian religion? And yet, upon the decision of this issue rests the religious well-being of the next generation. Our children will believe that Jesus is the Christ, and be Christian; or they will disbelieve it, and be infidel.

We have seen that in the first quarter of our century a reaction from the dogmas of Protestantism, as Protestantism itself was a reaction from those of Romanism, led to the organization of a Church based upon a recognition of the official relations of Jesus Christ to the world. Guided by the Word of God exclusively, they received him as "the Christ, the Son of the living God," making him, in contrast with the doctrines of creeds, the ground of their faith, their love, and their life. We have also noticed the course of unbelieving thought narrowing down its controversy with Christianity to this single issue. We have observed, too, that while Roman Catholic and the Protestant sects may have implied this issue in their authoritative formulas of doctrine, they have failed to make a distinctive issue, and to affirm it. On the contrary, they continue to throw the whole weight of their opposition against those who do. From the standpoint which we have now reached, the intelligent reader will be able to define the relation to the great living issue of the time, of all the parties now striving to gain the faith of men. Several weighty results follow the position taken, only one of which our proposed limits will permit us to notice. It is worthy of reverent and thankful attention to observe how that all-wise, overruling Providence, that makes all things work together for good, is making the unbelief of

the present the source of a deeper faith in Christ, and a higher Christian civilization for the future. Certainly, we may believe that there are very many true-hearted men, not too much enslaved to hereditary dogmatism, men who love the Christ, who will be forced, by the crisis of religious thought through which we are passing, to face the true issue, and to take a position from which a defense of Christianity is possible. It is not impossible that future generations will feel more indebted to such men as Strauss, Renan, Buckle, Lecky, and the author of "*Ecce Homo*" for the establishment of the faith of Christ, than to all the influences of Romanism and Protestantism combined. Christianity has in no period of her history held a position from which she had so much to hope. Rarely, if ever, has she found her opposers in a position which she could strike with such advantage; while placing herself on the one issue which her Author makes with the world, affords her an opportunity to test the loyalty of her professed friends to her superlative claims. Those who love the Christ more than they do party, will not hesitate to rally to her defense. Those who do not, will sink into a deeper and narrower sectarianism, and, perhaps, linger on in a chronic state between life and death, as some are already doing. He that hath the love of God and his truth in his heart, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundantly, but from him that hath not, the little capacity to be elevated into true Christian manhood will soon perish and vanish away. In the inspired grouping of the discourses of the Savior by Matthew, it is not without the most pointed significance that discerning the signs of the times has been placed in connection with the answer demanded of the disciples to the question we have been considering. The men of that generation who led religious thought, possessed remarkable sagacity in reading the phenomena of nature; but the phenomenon of the ages, the signs of the times, they could not see. The crisis of an age is the decision of the question which preceding centuries has delivered into its hands for solution, and upon which depends the life of succeeding generations; and, perhaps, the highest achievement of the intelligence of a generation is the conscious possession and mastery of the ground-question of its time, "Whoso is wise will observe these things; even they shall understand the loving kindness of the Lord."

III.—HARMONY OF THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE.

IN treating of this subject, I invite the attention of the reader to the brief consideration of the following propositions :

I. *The Bible was not given to mankind to instruct them in any system or department of science ; but simply for the purpose of revealing to them a system of religion that is divinely adapted to the wants and circumstances of all.*

For the proof of this, I need only refer the reader to the Bible itself. A very superficial acquaintance with its contents is sufficient to satisfy any one that Jesus Christ is himself the Alpha and the Omega of all that is revealed to us in the Living Oracles. And hence it is said, in Revelation xix, 10: "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Compare John xx, 31.

It is not, therefore, to be regarded as a defect in the Bible that it does not instruct us in the best modes of farming ; the best systems of civil government, finance, and education ; and the best ways and means of discovering and appropriating all that God has laid up in store for us in the kingdoms of nature. We do not regard it as a defect in the microscope that it does not reveal to us the magnitude, laws, and peculiar treasures of unseen worlds ; nor of the telescope, that it does not portray to our imperfect vision the ten thousand times ten thousand animalculæ that sport unseen in the various fluids that lie both within and around us. No sane man finds fault with a rail-car, because it does not transport him across the ocean ; nor with the telegraph, because it does not enable him to converse with the inhabitants of other worlds. It is enough that every art, and science, and instrument has its own specific object, its own proper range and sphere of usefulness. So long as it serves the purpose for which it was intended, no one has a right to complain. The practical mathematician has constant use for the rules of algebra and the demonstrations of geometry. But he would be a poor moralist or metaphysician who would, like Comte, attempt to introduce mathematics into the region of psychology, and measure the wants and capacities of the human soul by the fluxions of Sir Isaac Newton.

In like manner, the Bible has its object: an object which lies partly within and also immeasurably beyond the scope and limits of all finite reason. So far as it respects this one end and object, we have reason to expect that all in the Bible should be perfect; that there should be no deficiency in any of its provisions, nor any want of adaptation between means and ends. But for any want of instruction on other matters, the Bible is not responsible.

II. *In giving to mankind this revelation of his will, it has pleased God to make it through the same imperfect media by means of which they were then accustomed to communicate to each other their own thoughts, affections, and desires.*

To do this, or to impart to all men throughout all time, the gift of inspiration was a necessity. There was no other conceivable alternative. If the scheme of justification by faith was to be revealed to mankind at all, in order to faith, then indeed it follows, of necessity, either that God should give it to the world as he has done, by inspiring a few persons to communicate it to others as perfectly as possible through the medium of their own imperfect vernacular; or otherwise, that he should give it to all men by direct inspiration, as he did to the apostles and prophets. The last method would certainly have had some apparent advantages; and many may think that, on the whole, it would have been preferable to the plan which has been adopted. But this is a subject too high for us. No finite mind is capable of solving such a problem. Many other matters in the Divine administration seem equally strange to us. Why, for instance, did not God at first give to all men a perfect language? Why did he not, by inspiration, make known to the ancient patriarchs, and through them to their posterity, all the useful arts, sciences, and inventions which are now filling the world with their refining and elevating influences? Why were men left to work out so many important results for themselves? To these, and a thousand other similar questions, the best and most satisfactory answer that can be given is simply this: *God so willed it.* He alone understands the beginning and the end of all things; and what, in all cases and under all circumstances, is most for his own glory and the good of his creatures. Whenever, therefore, God speaks, human reason should be silent. The highest prerogative of the finite is to simply acquiesce in the decrees of the Infinite. Whatever God does is

right. And hence we have no doubt that the plan of inspiring a few men to communicate the Gospel to others through the medium of their own imperfect vernacular, was the very best that could have been adopted under the circumstances. To have substituted the technical language of modern science for the common dialects of the masses would have been barbarous in the extreme. The true philosopher stoops to instruct as well as to conquer.

III. *The Bible is not, therefore, responsible for any deficiency in the means and media of its communications.*

The missionary who goes to India for the purpose of preaching to the natives Jesus Christ and him crucified, often finds it necessary to refer to their false notions of philosophy, and to use even their idolatrous nomenclature, as the very best possible means of imparting to them a knowledge of the true God, and of the only way and means of pardon for guilty men. And just so it was with the Holy Spirit when it first came on its mission of love to earth. Its object was not to create a new language, nor to frame new systems of philosophy; but simply to communicate to mankind, in the best possible way, God's scheme of grace and benevolence. And hence we find that it generally spoke in the language, style, and dialect of the common people. This I will endeavor to illustrate by a few examples.

From the beginning of the world to the time of Copernicus, it was the generally received opinion that the earth is the immovable center of the universe; and that the sun, moon, and stars are set as lights in the concave arch of the firmament, and in some mysterious way make their daily revolutions from east to west. And hence the Holy Spirit, in perfect harmony with the tenor and object of its mission, spoke of the sun as "*rising*," "*setting*," "*going down*," "*standing still*," etc. Ages rolled on, but the dialect of the people, with regard to astronomical phenomena, was unchanged. None but some daring genius, such as Pythagoras and a few of his followers, ever presumed to call into question its literal correctness; and in the second century of the Christian era, Ptolemy, of Alexandria, wrote a treatise on the *Geocentric Theory* of astronomy, which, for fifteen hundred years, was the astronomical text-book of Christendom. But in the sixteenth century, the great work of Copernicus on the *Heliocentric Theory* of astronomy was published to the world. It was at once received and publicly defended by Giordano Bruno and a few others; and early in

the seventeenth century, the discoveries of Galileo aroused all Christendom. The Pope and his cardinals became alarmed. Copernicus, though dead, was proclaimed to be a heretic; Bruno was burned at the stake, and Galileo was twice forced to abjure his philosophical opinions, and to subscribe to the *Geocentric Theory* of astronomy, which was at that time generally regarded as the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. But as learning revived, and the laws and principles of Sacred Hermeneutics became better understood, it was generally conceded that the Bible is not committed to any theory of astronomy; that the Holy Spirit had a higher mission than to decide on the correctness or incorrectness of astronomical hypotheses; and that it simply used the formulæ of speech then current among the people as a means of communicating to mankind the Gospel of the grace of God just as astronomers now use the same formulæ for the purpose of communicating their ideas to the uneducated masses. And hence no one now objects to the Bible on the ground that it indorses the geocentric theory of astronomy.

I might still further illustrate the truth of this proposition by considering the notions of the Hebrews about the firmament; about the shape and dimensions of the earth; about sheol, the place of departed spirits; about the viscera as the seat of the affections, etc. But I think that enough has been said to satisfy all candid and reasonable inquirers after truth, that the Holy Spirit is in no way chargeable with the errors and defects that may appear in the *media* of its communications; and that it is only when the phenomena, laws, and forces of nature are referred to or stated as *ultimate facts*, that we have a right to expect and require that the statements be made with absolute accuracy.

IV. *It is important, also, to remember that until we understand the Bible perfectly, and Nature perfectly, seeming contradictions and inconsistencies are constantly liable to arise from our own ignorance.*

But this much no living man yet understands. The first chapter of Genesis is still very differently interpreted, by even the most learned scholars of the nineteenth century. And the same is true of many other portions of the Bible. True, indeed, the way of duty is very clearly and distinctly marked out on its sacred pages; but, beneath and on either side of this way, there are depths which even the archangel has never sounded. And hence it is that almost every

year now serves to modify, in some way, and to some extent, the formerly received laws and principles of Sacred Hermeneutics.

And this is true, to even a much greater extent, of the book of nature. If we except the single department of pure mathematics, where can we find the science that has not been variously changed and modified by the progress of knowledge within the last five, ten, fifteen, or twenty years? Where is it? Where are the text-books of Chemistry, Mineralogy, Botany, Zoölogy, Geology, Physiology, Natural Philosophy, Astronomy, Psychology, Moral Philosophy, and Political Economy, that were regarded as standard works in our best colleges twenty-five years ago? The progress of knowledge, within even this short period, has rendered most of them obsolete; and many of their hypotheses, once received and regarded as scientific truths, have vanished before the light of science, as darkness before the rising sun of the morning.

And what, after all our vain boasting, do we really yet know of science? What is matter, and what is spirit, and what is their bond of union? What is light? what is heat? what is electricity? and what is magnetism? What is life, and what is death? How do the grasses grow, the flowers bloom, and the tender buds bring forth, from the same elements, so great a variety of precious fruits? What is the distance to the most brilliant of the fixed stars, and what are the dimensions of this universe? How many worlds does it contain, and what is the number, and what the character of their inhabitants? To all these, and ten thousand times ten thousand other questions, Science gives no definitive answer. She yet knows but in part, and that, too, in a very small part. She has scarcely yet mastered the alphabet of the book of nature. But, nevertheless, she sometimes puts on airs, and talks as haughtily and as dogmatically as if she were endowed with the attribute of Omniscience. I speak, now, of Science falsely so-called. True Science is always modest, and, like her illustrious patron, Sir Isaac Newton, is always willing and ready to acknowledge that the great ocean of truth lies before her yet unexplored.

It would be marvelous then, indeed, if, knowing as little as we do of the Bible, and still far less of nature, there should not occasionally arise, in the course of our very limited researches, some apparent discrepancies in the sublime teachings of these two wonderful

volumes. But, in such cases, there is no cause of alarm ; and nothing is gained by either ecclesiastical or scientific intolerance. Let all lovers of truth patiently and calmly work on, feeling assured that in the end Religion and Science will mutually embrace each other as loving sisters of the same Divine parentage.

V. Notwithstanding this constant liability to meet with apparent discrepancies between Divine revelation and the book of nature, it is gratifying to know that the more profound study of both has always served to remove all seeming contradictions, and that so far as these two volumes are now well understood, there is between them the most perfect harmony.

In illustrating this proposition, I will consider,

I. THE EPOCH OF CREATION.

Previous to the beginning of the nineteenth century, it was the common opinion of most Biblical critics, that the world was created about six thousand years ago ; some alleging that all the rocks, stratified and unstratified, were created just as they are ; while others were of the opinion that the stratified rocks, with their numerous fossils, were produced partly by secondary antediluvian causes, and partly by the agency of the Noachic deluge. But, as geologists progressed with their investigations, it became evident that the aforesaid theological hypothesis was untenable, and that the earth must have been in existence for a much longer period than six thousand years. It was, moreover, further ascertained, with a good degree of probability :

1. That the earth was, at first, in a state of igneous fusion, and that the oldest unstratified rocks (granite) were produced by the gradual cooling of its surface.

2. That all other unstratified rocks, such as syenite, porphyry, greenstone, trachite, basalt, etc., have been produced in like manner, by the cooling of the original lava ; and hence they are all called *igneous* rocks.

3. That the stratified rocks have been formed in water. After the primitive earth was sufficiently cooled to permit the condensed vapor to rest as water on its surface, the process of disintegration would at once commence, owing to the constant agitation of these waters by volcanic action. In this way the original granite, mixed with other substances, would be formed into gneiss, mica slate, marble, talcose slate, hornblende slate, quartz, clay slate, etc.

4. During this primitive period the whole earth was too intensely hot to allow any living thing to remain on its surface; and, hence, the rocks deposited during that period are called *azoic* rocks. But, as ages rolled on, the surface became cooler, and vegetables and animals were then created. Those of the first age were all *marine*, and generally of the lowest orders. They are first found in the Silurian formation.

5. How long the Silurian age lasted we have no certain means of knowing. That it was of long duration, however, is evident from the immense thickness of the rocks that were then deposited. But, when all the agencies then employed had fulfilled their mission, the fountains of the great deep were broken up; all living animals and vegetables were destroyed, and the whole surface of the earth was again thrown into a state of chaos.

6. After this, the Devonian age was ushered in, and new species of animals and plants were created to serve as ministers of God in preparing the earth for the abode of man. These fulfilled their mission, and the earth was again broken up, and all living species destroyed, preparatory to the work of the Carboniferous age. To this again succeeded, in order, the Permian, the Triassic, the Lias, the Oolite, the Wealden, the Chalk, the Tertiary, the Drift, and the Alluvium.

How many of these ages, with their separate and distinct formations of stratified rock, have occurred since the epoch of creation, is uncertain. On this point geologists are not agreed. But we are assured by President Hitchcock, "*that there were on the globe, previous to the existing races, not less than five distinct periods of organized existence; that is, five great groups of animals and plants, so completely independent of each other, that no species whatever is found in more than one of them, lived and successively passed away before the creation of the races that now occupy the surface. Other standard writers make the number of these periods of existence as many as twelve. Comparative Anatomy testifies that so unlike in structure were these different groups, that they could not have co-existed in the same climate and other external circumstances.*"*

These were stubborn facts. They were indelibly stereotyped on the whole surface of the earth; on its loftiest mountains as well as

* Religion of Geology, p. 22.

in its deepest valleys. What, then, was to be done? For a time, infidels rejoiced, and many of the more feeble advocates of Divine revelation trembled. But the more learned and thoughtful were undisturbed. They well knew in whom and also in what they had believed; but, nevertheless, they thought it quite possible that they might have misinterpreted Moses in this case as their fathers had done before them, in the discussion of the great astronomical problem; and they therefore resolved on a more critical exegesis of the first chapter of Genesis. It was done, and the problem was soon solved. From a critical examination of the Hebrew text, they saw, with Justin Martyr, Origen, Augustine, and some other Christian fathers, that Moses does not fix or determine the epoch of creation; that there is really no connection between the first and second verses of Genesis; and that, as Luther once said, without having any reference to geology, "*there should be drawn a very broad black line between them.*" They saw, moreover, that the work of each day is introduced by the very significant phrase, "*And God said.*" And hence they inferred that the first two verses of Genesis describe events that must have occurred previous to the first day.

The problem was now more than half solved. It only remained to reconcile with this exegesis the known facts of geology. This was easily done. To such men as Dr. Thomas Chalmers and others of enlarged minds and liberal education, it now seemed evident,

1. That the first verse of Genesis describes creation absolute: the original generation of all the materials of the entire physical universe.

2. That the second verse has reference to the chaotic state of the earth after the last general breaking up of its surface just before the beginning of the Adamic renovation. "The earth was then waste-ness and emptiness, and darkness was on the face of the abyss; and the Spirit of God was brooding on the face of the waters."

3. That between these two epochs, given in the first and second verses of Genesis, as many ages may have occurred as will satisfy all the demands of natural science. But to describe these was no part of the work of Moses.

4. That when the fullness of time was come, God introduced the *Historic Period*, or Adamic era, by his own omnipotent fiat, as recorded in the third verse of Genesis. "And God said, Let there be light, and there was light."

5. And, finally, that the entire work of fitting up the earth for the use, comfort, and happiness of man, was accomplished within the brief space of six ordinary days of twenty-four hours each; and that on the seventh day of the same length, God rested from all his works. Compare Exodus xx, 8-11.*

Thus it was that Religion and Science once more met together, and that Nature and Revelation again mutually embraced and sustained each other.

This discussion touching the epoch of creation throws some light on sundry other points of much interest to the student. Such, for instance, as the following:

I. That all things, save God, had a beginning. This fact is repeatedly declared in the Holy Scriptures. And though the testimony of Nature is not conclusive with regard to this point, it nevertheless certainly all leans in the same direction. The natural history of the earth carries us back to a time when there were no animals, no plants, no rocks, no soils; nothing, indeed, but inert matter in a state of igneous fusion. If it could go a step further and utter even one more articulate sound, would it not be to simply announce the creation of the material universe in harmony with the sublime oracle of the first verse of Genesis?

* It may be a satisfaction to some of my readers to know that several other modes of reconciling the known facts of geology with the Mosaic account of creation have been proposed and supported by men distinguished alike for their love of the Bible and their scientific attainments. Such, for instance, are the following:

I. That the six days of creation in the Mosaic account are not literal days of twenty-four hours each; but long periods of indefinite and unequal length. Advocated by Hugh Miller, Professor Silliman, Professor Dana, etc.

II. That each of these demiurgic days stands as the closing day and *representative* of a long and indefinite period. Advocated by Bishop Horsley, Professor Jameson, etc.

III. That in the Mosaic account we have a sort of pictorial representation of the progressive work of creation, just as we have in the Apocalypse a pictorial presentation of the fortunes and destiny of the Church. Supported by Dr. Knapp and most allegorical interpreters.

IV. That the narrative of the six days' work has no reference to the original creation of the earth, nor even to its general renovation; but merely to the fitting up of a *portion of its surface* for the use of man. Advocated by Dr. John Pye Smith.

These theories, the reader will observe, are all supported by the authority of great and illustrious names. But, nevertheless, I have no hesitation in preferring the mode of reconciliation given in our text. This hypothesis, advocated in the main by Chalmers, Harris, King, Hitchcock, etc., seems to harmonize perfectly with both the facts of geology and the Mosaic narrative. For myself, I can not, on this hypothesis, see even the appearance of any discrepancy between the testimony of the rocks and the record of Moses.

2. That man was created at a comparatively late period. The time, as given by Moses, was about six thousand years ago; and with this statement agree all the *known facts* of geology. "No human remains," says President Hitchcock, "have been found below those alluvial deposits which are now forming by rivers, lakes, and the ocean. Hence geology infers that man was one of the latest animals that was placed on the globe."*

3. That God ordinarily works by means of second causes, as far as these can be made to serve his purposes. But when they are not sufficient, he then works miraculously; then he himself speaks, and it is done; he commands, and it stands fast. Of the truth of this we have, in the testimony of Nature as well as in the testimony of the Bible, very clear and convincing evidence. So far as these two witnesses give any testimony on this point, it is to the effect that there is no such thing as either "*spontaneous generation*" or the "*transmutation of species*;" but that all kinds of both animals and plants owe their origin to the creative fiat of Omnipotence.

II. CREATION OF LIGHT.

To the Mosaic account of the creation of light, given in the third verse of Genesis, infidels have filed two objections. It is opposed, say they,

I. To astronomy, because it represents light as having been created before the sun. And,

II. To geology, because we are taught by this science that light existed many ages before the Adamic epoch. It seems clear, from the Testimony of the Rocks, that animals having eyes lived during even the Silurian and Devonian ages. But the existence of an eye always implies the contemporaneous existence of light.

How, then, are these objections to be met, and the harmony of Science and the Bible again vindicated?

To do this, in the present imperfect state of optical science, may be very difficult, perhaps, indeed, impossible. Before such a demand can be reasonably made of us, it should first be demonstrated what light is, what are its laws, and what are its properties. But these are still matters of inquiry with even many of our ablest philosophers.

* Religion of Geology, p. 23; also Lyell's Prin. Geol., vol. 1, pp. 249, 282.

It is now, however, pretty generally conceded,

1. That every planet is surrounded with an extremely fine and subtile fluid called "*luminiferous ether*."*

2. That it is the peculiar property of the sun and other luminous bodies to cause this ether to vibrate with almost inconceivable rapidity.

3. That through the influence of these vibrations on the optic nerve, light is produced, very much as sound is produced by the vibrations of the atmosphere on the tympanum of the ear. And hence this is called the *undulatory* or *waving theory* of light.†

Now, if this hypothesis is true, it is not difficult to reconcile all the known facts and phenomena of optical science with the teachings of Moses. For we may certainly assume, with a very high degree of probability,

1. That the sun was *created*, with all other parts of the material universe, "in the beginning." (Genesis i, 1.)

2. That there was light during the pre-Adamic ages. But, as the light, temperature, etc., of those times were not, according to Comparative Anatomy, well suited to existing species, the luminiferous ether of those primitive ages was like the pre-Adamic atmosphere, absorbed in the general changes and convulsions which occurred just before the beginning of the Historic Period. If so, terrestrial darkness was, of course, the immediate effect.

3. That, on the first day, when God said "Let there be light," he simply reproduced the luminiferous ether, as he did the atmosphere on the day following. In that event, the whole hemisphere, next to the sun, would be at once illuminated.

*It is the opinion of most philosophers that this ether is universally diffused. But of this, the evidence is by no means satisfactory; and, as every planet has its own atmosphere, it is more probable that it has, also, its own *luminiferous ether*, specially adapted to the peculiar wants and circumstances of its own varied tenantry.

†The *corpuscular theory* of Sir Isaac Newton, beautiful as it was, has, nevertheless, proved to be defective, and it is, therefore, now very generally abandoned by our ablest natural philosophers. And this, ere long, may also be the fate of the undulatory theory. The history of science is largely made up of an account of theories and hypotheses which, like so many brilliant meteors, glowed and dazzled for a while, and then perished forever. "On the one subject of Geology," says Mr. A. Barnes, in his lectures on the "Evidences of Christianity in the Nineteenth Century," p. 89, "so early as the year 1806, the French Institute counted more than eighty theories hostile to Scripture history, not one of which has stood to the present day."

How true it is that "All flesh is as grass, and all the glory and speculations of men are but as the flowers of the grass. The grass withereth, and the flowers thereof fade away, but THE WORD OF THE LORD ENDURES FOREVER!"

4. That, on the fourth day, probably, when the clouds and vapors were all dispersed, and the sun, moon, and stars were for the first time made visible from the surface of the earth, God assigned to these heavenly bodies their office as our time-keepers. This is all that is really implied in the words of Moses. It is not said in the text that they were then *created*. God simply then *made* (*ahsah*) them our chronometers, just as he made the rainbow a sign of the Noachic covenant, and as he made David a king over Israel.*

If this explanation is not satisfactory to the skeptical objector, we promise to do better whenever he will demonstrate to us what is the true theory and philosophy of light. In the mean time it is gratifying to know that, so far as the science of optics is understood, there is really no discrepancy whatever between it and the narrative of Moses.

III. EXTENT OF THE NOACHIC DELUGE.

It has long been a standing objection with infidels, that science is irreconcilably opposed to the Mosaic account of the Noachic deluge. Moses, say they, clearly teaches not only that the flood was universal,

*I have given here what, on the whole, seems to me to be the most satisfactory solution of this very difficult and complicated problem. But it is, perhaps, due to the reader to say that several other methods of reconciling the narrative of Moses with the science of Optics have been advocated by men of the highest attainments in both Natural Science and Sacred Literature. The most plausible of these may be stated as follows. It claims:

1. That the sun, moon, and stars were all created "in the beginning."
2. That the same luminiferous ether has existed from the beginning; and that it most likely pervades all space.
3. That Moses describes things *phenomenally*; that is, as they would have appeared to a spectator on the surface of the earth.
4. That, on the beginning of the first day, which was evening, the atmosphere was so filled with dense fogs and vapors, that no light from the sun could penetrate it. All on the surface of the earth was in absolute darkness; but, as the earth revolved on its axis, God caused so much of the vapor to be precipitated from the atmosphere as to permit the light to shine through the fogs and mists which still rested on the surface of the earth, and thus was produced the first morning.
5. That the same atmosphere also existed, most likely, from the beginning; but that, after the last great cataclysm antecedent to the Adamic renovation, it was completely filled with vapor, as it sometimes now is on a very foggy morning, till the second day, when, by another fiat, God rendered the lower part of it perfectly *transparent*, and thus separated the waters which were above the firmament from the waters which were below the firmament.
6. That dense clouds covered the face of the sky till the fourth day, when God removed the veil, and caused the sun, moon, and stars to appear in their full-orbed glories in the heavens. Then it was that they were, by Divine appointment, set apart as our chronometers, and made to rule our days, and months, and years.

Of these two hypotheses, the reader may take his choice. Perhaps they both express part of the truth as it was revealed to Moses by inspiration.

but, also, that it rose fifteen cubits above the tops of the highest mountains. But Science teaches us that this is impossible. And, hence, they allege that there is here a direct conflict between Science and Revelation.

To this objection two answers have been given by Christian philosophers.

I. *That Moses, fairly interpreted, does not teach that the deluge was universal.* And

II. *That though he does clearly and unmistakably affirm its universality, he, nevertheless, affirms nothing that is impossible or inconsistent with science.*

These positions have been severally maintained by men of the highest repute for both their scientific and Biblical attainments; and the subject under consideration may, therefore, be justly regarded rather as a question of Biblical interpretation than of Biblical and scientific harmony. But, nevertheless, as its discussion will serve to remove doubts, and at the same time to illustrate some of the fundamental laws of Sacred Hermeneutics, I will briefly consider some of the main points involved in this very interesting controversy.

The language of Moses, taken literally, proves, beyond all doubt, that the deluge was universal. See Genesis vii, 19-23, and ix, 8-17. And so, also, do the words of Peter in the third chapter of his second Epistle. This much is conceded by all parties. And, as it is a fundamental rule of interpretation that "all words must be taken in their literal sense unless it can be shown that, for reasons clear and satisfactory, they should be construed figuratively," the presumption is in favor of the old hypothesis, that the deluge was universal, and the burden of proof falls on those who would limit it to a portion of the earth's surface.

This is also conceded by all who have any respect for the authority of Divine Revelation; such, for instance, as Dr. John Pye Smith, Hugh Miller, President Edward Hitchcock, and many others, eminent for their piety as well as for their scientific attainments. These gentlemen willingly assume the "*onus probandi*," and proceed to maintain their ground by such arguments as the following: They allege

I. That the distributive terms *all*, *whole*, *each*, *every*, etc., are often used in a restricted sense, in both sacred and profane literature. It

is said, for instance, in Genesis xli, 57, that "*all countries* came into Egypt, to Joseph, to buy corn; because the famine was sore in *all lands*." Besides, it is a well-known fact that the Chaldeans, Medo-Persians, Greeks, and Romans were all wont to speak of their several empires as co-extensive with the world; and hence it follows that it would be very absurd to interpret the *geographical* terms of the Bible, and other books of like antiquity, as if they were directly addressed to an enlightened audience of the nineteenth century. These, like many other words in the Bible, have a *historical* meaning, and should always be interpreted according to the circumstances under which they were written or spoken.

This reasoning is all very just, so far as it goes. It proves beyond all doubt that these distributive terms *may* be used in a limited sense, and that if the revelations and developments of Science should render such an interpretation of the Mosaic account of the deluge necessary, the Bible would not suffer any more from it than it did from the astronomical demonstrations of Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, and Sir Isaac Newton. But, beyond this, the argument has no force. It does not follow that because these terms are used sometimes in a restricted sense, that they are, therefore, always so used. Such a conclusion would be wholly unwarranted by any and all the rules of sound logic.

II. They say that it is absurd to suppose that God would inundate the whole earth merely for the purpose of destroying a population that was confined, in all probability, to a small portion of Western Asia.

But here, it seems to me, there is an undue assumption of premises; for,

1. How do these men know that the antediluvian population was limited to a small part of Western Asia? If, in the course of seven generations, the posterity of Jacob amounted to about two and a half or three millions of people, what might not the posterity of Adam have become in the space of 1,656 years?

2. Are they perfectly sure that God had no other object in view than simply to destroy the wicked antediluvians? Do not such facts as the great change which then took place in the period of human life, clearly indicate that at that time very great *physical changes* took place over the whole earth? And does it not, therefore, seem to

follow that at least one of God's main purposes in this tremendous cataclysm, was to better adapt this whole mundane system of things to the wants and circumstances of fallen man?

3. It seems probable, from 1 Peter iii, 20, 21, that the deluge had a *typical* as well as a *penal* design. The meaning of the passage seems to be this: that as the antitype baptism now saves us from the power, influence, and dominion of sin by introducing us into Christ, the only real ark of safety, so the waters of the deluge saved eight souls from, perhaps, both natural and spiritual death, by bringing them into the ark and putting a stop to the torrent of vice which had then covered the earth.

III. They allege that the ark was not of sufficient capacity to hold two of every species of unclean, and seven of every species of clean animals.

This is an argument of recent origin. It was very generally conceded, a few years ago, that the ark was large enough to contain two of every living species of birds and terrestrial animals. But naturalists have recently been very busy in multiplying the number of living species. In 1614, Sir Walter Raleigh estimated the number of existing mammal species at 89; in 1765, Buffon estimated them at 200; but they are now estimated, by Mr. Johnson and others, at about 1,658. This great increase in the number of living species, says Hugh Miller, is owing partly to discovery, and partly to greater scientific scrutiny. He says that Buffon, for instance, made the African and Asiatic elephants but one species, but now they are ascertained to be two.

This, then, would seem to be a very strong argument, if we could rely on the premises. But here, again, there is most likely an undue assumption. Many naturalists now affirm, with great confidence, that there are not less than fifteen or twenty species of the genus *homo*! but we have the best and highest authority for affirming that man is a *species* and not a *genus*; that God has, in fact, made of one blood all the nations of men that dwell on the face of the earth. (Acts xvii, 26.) It is, therefore, quite probable that other species have been unwarrantably multiplied in similar ratios.

IV. They allege that the present distribution of animals and plants is inconsistent with the universality of the deluge. Most naturalists reckon as many as fourteen zoölogical and twenty-five

botanical provinces on the present surface of the earth ; and, hence, they infer that there were just so many original centers of creation, and that these were unaffected by the deluge.

But, would it require any more power *to distribute* animals, as we now find them, in their several provinces, than it did *to collect* them into the ark? (See Genesis vii, 14-16.) Besides, the same difficulty in kind, though, perhaps, not in degree, exists with regard to the distribution of the human species ; but we know that they were all dispersed from Babel, as a common center. (Genesis xi.)

V. They allege that there is not a sufficient amount of water on the surface of the earth and in the atmosphere to produce a universal deluge. If the earth were reduced to a perfect sphere, and all existing waters were distributed equally over its surface, it is supposed that they would form an ocean of only about three or three and a half feet in depth.

This argument is plausible, and, to the natural man, it may seem to be quite conclusive. But we must remember :

1. That all things are possible with God. He may have effected all this chiefly by a miracle, and with just as much ease as Christ fed the five thousand men on five loaves and two fishes.

2. That we have the unequivocal testimony of the rocks, that many of the highest mountains of Europe, Asia, and America were, at a comparatively recent period, covered with water to such a depth that immense icebergs, loaded with huge masses of granite, gneiss, sand, etc., were carried quite over their summits, from the Arctic and Antarctic regions, toward the equator ; producing, it would seem, a universal deluge. "The stones," says Professor Dana, "are of all dimensions, from that of a small pebble to masses as large as a moderate-sized house. One, at Bradford, in Massachusetts, is thirty feet each way, and its weight is estimated to be at least 4,500,000 pounds. Many, on Cape Cod, are twenty feet in diameter. One lying on a naked ledge at Whittingham, in Vermont, measures forty-three feet in length, and thirty in height and width, or, 40,000 cubic feet in bulk, and was probably transported across Deerfield valley, the bottom of which is 500 feet below the spot where it lies. . . . The distance to which the stones were transported, as learned by comparing them with the rocks in place to the north, is mostly between twenty and forty miles, though in some cases sixty miles or more.

. . . The rocky ledges over which the drift was borne are often *scratched* in closely crowded parallel lines. The scratchings or groovings are often deep and broad channelings, at times even a foot in depth, and several feet wide, as if made by a tool of great size as well as power. They are found in the valleys and on the slopes of mountains to a height, on the Green Mountains, of 5,000 feet.*

To these interesting facts may also be added the following from Hitchcock's *Elementary Geology*. The author says: "It is a characteristic of drift, by which it is distinguished from disintegrated rock, that it has been removed from its original position; it may be only a few rods, but more frequently a great many miles. And by the bowlders and trains of gravel and sand which it has left along the way, we can trace it back to its origin. . . . To begin with the American continent at the north-easterly point, where observations to be depended on have been made, we find that the bowlders spread over the southern part of Nova Scotia were derived from the ledges in the northern part of the province. Throughout the whole extent of Maine, the evidence is very striking of a southerly transport of the drift, the course being usually a few degrees east of south. And transported bowlders are even found toward the summit of Katahdin, which is 5,300 feet high. . . . According to Mr. Darwin, the equatorial regions of South America, especially the vast plains in the eastern parts, present few or no examples of transported bowlders or erratics. But beyond 41° south latitude, and near the Cordilleras, they show themselves in Chili and Patagonia. Sir Robert Schomburg has also described enormous far-transported blocks in British Guiana. Prof. Studer states that in the hill country at the foot of the Himalaya Mountains, erratic bowlders occur. Close along the foot of these mountains, says Capt. Strachey, we find the soil to be everywhere composed of deposits of bowlders and gravel. This detritus may be the result of glaciers. And such may be also the origin of similar accumulations in the mountains south of Algiers in Africa."

Do not such facts serve very greatly to corroborate the Mosaic account of the deluge? Is it not most likely that the drift was the effect of those tremendous convulsions of nature which then shook this rock-ribbed earth from its center to its circumference? So it was once thought, says President Hitchcock, but this opinion, he

*Dana's Text-Book of Geology, pp. 220-222.

says, is now very generally abandoned by *geologists* for the following reasons:

1. "That water alone could not have produced the drift; immense icebergs were also necessary."

This may also be true of the deluge. Moses describes simply the *fact*, not the *means* by which it was produced. It is evident, however, that both natural and miraculous means were used.

2. "No remains of man, nor of his works, have been found in the drift; nor, indeed, till we rise almost to the top of the alluvial deposits."

This is just what we might anticipate, as the drift was carried from the uninhabited polar regions, and consisted chiefly of pre-Adamic formations.

3. "Many organic remains found in the alluvium, considerably above the drift, are of extinct species."

May not the upper part of the drift be often mistaken for alluvium? During the flood the large boulders would, of course, be deposited first, then the smaller fragments of rocks, and, finally, the gravel and clay similar to alluvium.

4. "The agency producing the drift must have operated during a much longer period than 370 days."

This objection is based on the assumption that the deluge was brought on and continued merely by the force of natural causes, operating with their ordinary intensity. But this is not at all probable.

On the whole, then, I am constrained to think that the arguments given are not sufficient to set aside the literal interpretation of the aforesaid passages. It seems more reasonable to conclude, in the light of both Natural Science and Sacred Hermeneutics, that the Noachic deluge was universal; as the final conflagration will also be universal. But, whichever mode of interpretation is adopted, the student of the Bible may rest assured that there is here no more conflict between Natural Science and the Bible than there is between Natural Science and the testimony of every formation of the pre-Adamic earth. On these imperishable and rock-bound folios are inscribed the history of not only many deluges, but also of many other signs and wonders quite as marvelous as any thing that is recorded by Moses concerning the deluge of Noah. Here, then, is

firm ground, on which the Christian may ever repose with confidence. The infidel must either wholly ignore the unequivocal testimony of the Silurian, Devonian, Carboniferous, Permian, Triassic, Lias, Oolite, Wealden, and Cretaceous rocks, or he must concede that there is nothing in the Mosaic account of the deluge that is, in any way, inconsistent with God's previous workings in preparing the earth for the abode and happiness of man.

I might now pass from the Physical Sciences to the Metaphysical, and draw many arguments and illustrations, especially from the various departments of Pneumatology; but, perhaps, enough has already been said to satisfy every candid and thoughtful reader, and I will, therefore, close this chapter of evidence by simply stating a *fact*, which is really of more value than many arguments. It is briefly this: account for it as we may, it is, nevertheless, patent to all who have eyes to see, ears to hear, and hearts to understand, that *Christianity has always flourished most in the light, and with the progress of science*. It had its origin in the most enlightened part of the ancient world; during the dark ages it somewhat declined, but revived rapidly with the revival of literature and the progress of science in the fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, and now it has a stronger hold on the understanding and the affections of mankind than it ever had before during any period of the world's history.

How, then, is all this to be accounted for? It can not be truthfully said of any other system of religion or of religious philosophy ever given to the world. The religious systems of the ancient Greeks, Romans, Druids, Chaldeans, Persians, and Egyptians have all passed away; Mohammedanism is rapidly waning and vanishing before the rising and rapidly increasing splendors of the sun of science; and so, also, are Brahmanism and Buddhism. But Christianity is gaining power with every new discovery of truth; with every new development of science which really serves to emancipate and deliver mankind from the bondage and tyranny of ignorance, superstition, and crime, and which inclines them to regard and treat each other as free, moral, and responsible subjects of the moral government of Jehovah. Need we, then, any stronger evidence than this, to prove that the Author of the Book of Nature is also the Author of the Bible?

IV.—THE SPIRIT OF ROMANISM.

- Aspirations of Nature.* By I. T. HECKER. New York: James B. Kirker. 1859.
- Symbolism; or, Exposition of the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants, as evidenced by their Symbolical Writings.* By JOHN ADAM MOEHLER, D. D. Third Edition. New York: Catholic Publication House.
- A History of the Church, from the earliest Ages to the Reformation.* By the REV. GEORGE WADDINGTON, M. A. London: Baldwin & Craddock.
- An Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern; from the Birth of Christ to the beginning of the Eighteenth Century.* By JOHN LAURENCE MOSHEIM, D. D. Cincinnati: Applegate & Co. 1855.
- The History of Romanism, from the Earliest Corruptions of Christianity to the Present Time.* By JOHN DOWLING, D. D. New York: Edward Walker. 1853.
- The Roman Catholic Church and Free Thought: A Controversy between Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, and Thomas Vickers; together with the Encyclical Letter and Syllabus of Pope Pius IX, dated December 8, 1864.* Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll & Co. 1868.
- The Vickers and Purcell Controversy.* By JOHN B. PURCELL, Archbishop of Cincinnati. New York and Cincinnati: Benziger Brothers. 1868.

THE ablest Roman Catholic authors in America insist upon re-opening the case of their Church. They assure us, with every appearance of earnestness, that the judgment pronounced by the public upon the spirit of Romanism, is contrary to both law and evidence; is authorized neither by its doctrines nor its history. They beg us to believe that Romanism, so far from antagonizing human freedom, as the non-Catholic world has hitherto, with singular unanimity, concluded, is, in fact, its truest friend and most constant supporter. They even go farther, and insist that Protestantism, by which *their* system has been adjudged in the wrong, is itself the guilty party, and obnoxious to the very charges upon which it has arraigned and condemned the holy Roman Church. In one word, they appeal from the tribunal of the past to that of the present.

An issue is thus formed, which makes it necessary to re-examine the whole case; to bring forward, once more, the evidences in which its merits are involved, and to give them a dispassionate and candid consideration. And if, indeed, it shall be found that the decision of

the past was hasty and unauthorized, or, that the Church has so far changed its attitude to the world as to render such decision no longer applicable, it will be a pleasure, no less than a duty, to make the *amende honorable*.

The party moving in the matter should be first heard; and among its advocates there is none more earnest, and few, we suppose, more able, than the author of the "Aspirations of Nature." On the subject of "Reason and Freedom" he expresses himself—assuming at the same time to represent the position of his Church—in the following language:

"Endowed with reason, man has no right to surrender his judgment. Endowed with free-will, man has no right to yield up his liberty. Reason and free-will constitute man a responsible being, and he has no right to abdicate his independence. Reason, Liberty, Independence, these are divine and inalienable gifts; and man can not renounce them if he would."

Again he says:

"Religion is a question between God and the soul. No human authority, therefore, has any right to enter its sacred sphere. The attempt is sacrilegious."

Yet once more:

"The age demands a religion which unites reverence for God, with a profound respect for the divinely-gifted intelligence and heaven-born freedom of man."

The boldness of these utterances can not be too much admired. Happily, too, their meaning is expressed with so much clearness that none can mistake it. The author perceives, as by the intuition of genius, that the age demands a religion which recognizes and respects the freedom of conscience; a religion which not only tolerates, but which encourages, the exercise of reason, of judgment, and of independence. And not only does he perceive it to be the demand of the age, but he acknowledges, with perfect frankness, that the demand is right. In other words, he holds that as no religion *will* be, so no religion *should* be accepted by this generation which is wanting in these characteristics. And it is by the light of these principles that he asks us to examine the claims of the Roman Catholic Church. If Romanism—such is the evident meaning of his language—cherishes a profound respect for the divinely-gifted intelligence and heaven-born freedom of man; if it recognizes and fosters the sacred and inalienable rights of reason, liberty, and independence as divine gifts, which man dare not surrender if he would, then this system may be

regarded as meeting the demands of the age. Wanting these, it could have no claims to either our respect or our confidence.

Thus, the issue is presented in the clearest, simplest, and least ambiguous terms possible. Romanism is to be tested by its spirit. If it is the friend and supporter of freedom and independence, of reason and judgment, it is, to the extent of such fostering care, the true religion; and if not, it is false. Whether the submission, by the author, of so hazardous a test was the result of a sublime confidence in the ability of his Church to abide its application, or of a reckless audacity which hoped to deter investigation by the mere boldness of assertion, may, perhaps, be determined in the sequel; at present it is sufficient to emphasize the fact, now conceded, and even pressed upon the attention, by Romanists themselves, that *no religion is adapted to this age, or worthy of its acceptance, which does not acknowledge and respect the heaven-born freedom of man.*

So solicitous is our author not to be misunderstood respecting this leading principle, that he ventures even to express himself as follows :

"Every man was made by his Creator to do his own thinking. What right, then, has one man, or a body of men, to dictate to others their own belief, or make their private convictions or sentiments binding upon their fellows?"

If this language, and that previously quoted, be honestly meant—and we should be reluctant to believe the contrary—and if it expresses, as it claims to do, the genuine principles of the Romish Church, then, indeed, the grossest injustice has been done to its character and spirit. It teaches that man was created *free*; that his freedom is *inalienable*; that he is endowed with reason and free-will, with judgment, liberty, and independence; and that no human authority has the right to invade these sacred possessions. It teaches that every man was made by his Creator to do his own thinking; that religion is a matter between him and God alone; and that no man—such as the Pope, for example—and no body of men—such as the Council of Trent—has any right to dictate to him, or interfere with him. As for the individual himself, he has no right to *surrender* his judgment either to these or to any other human authority. The case is closed. The matter is settled. Romanists are free, absolutely and perfectly free, henceforth and forever. It follows, of course, that Romanism is adapted to the age, and worthy of all acceptance.

We should be most happy to believe it. Nothing—we write it in all sincerity—would rejoice us more than to be made thoroughly satisfied that this religion, whatever its corruptions in doctrine and worship, is the honest and ardent friend of true freedom. We should not, however, be expected to recognize the “wooden horse” as the palladium of our safety, and to introduce it with songs and rejoicings—eloquently as we have been urged to do so—until after we shall have examined its contents more closely. *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.*

The affair seems to us—if we may be permitted to change the figure—like a stage trick. Possibly, after all, it was only to amuse us that Mr. Hecker introduced his beloved mistress to the American public in so unexpected a costume. And if such was his design, he has succeeded to admiration. He brings her forward, to the astonishment of the audience, in the *role* of the Goddess of Liberty, and dressed, of course, in character. Her face, so long known, and so well, is covered with a mask which looks somewhat like reason; the “red, white, and blue” are garishly conspicuous in all her garments; he has placed upon her head a jaunty little cap, eminently suggestive of *sans culottes* and “*vive la liberte*”! while in one hand she is made to hold the “Star-spangled banner,” and with the other to stroke and fondle our “glorious bird” in the sweetest and most fascinating manner ever seen! *Spectatum admissi, risum teneatis amici?*

Sooth to say, it is a beautiful conception, and most admirably executed. As a *tableau vivant* we question if it has ever been excelled upon the American boards! And, now, if this lovely creature could only be persuaded to hold her tongue, and permit Father Hecker to do all the talking, the applause would doubtless be all that even he could desire. But, alas! she has been accustomed to be *heard*. Like the crow in the fable, she prides herself especially upon her *voice*. She grows visibly restive while the “manager,” in eloquent phrase, dilates upon the *inalienable* rights of reason and liberty. Like an experienced actress, however, she bears it heroically for a time; but when, at length, the well-meaning but indiscreet master of ceremonies announces that “*Every man* was made by his Creator to do *his own thinking*,” she can endure it no longer. Tearing off her mask, throwing away her cap of liberty, trampling under foot the “Stars and Stripes,” and telling the eagle to “Go,” she marches forward to the front of the stage, and with a copy of the Decrees and

Canons of Trent in her hand, proclaims, in imperial tone: "Whoever shall teach or *think* in opposition to *these decrees*, LET HIM BE ACCURSED!"

If we now turn to the Reverend Paulist and ask him how he harmonizes this authoritative declaration with his most liberal sentiments, his answer is ready:

"The authority of the general *councils* of the Catholic Church is, with its members, beyond all dispute. . . . Nothing is required to be believed but upon *adequate authority*, and *thus* the demands of the highest reason are satisfied. . . . If the Church be a divine authority, whose office is not to increase but define and confirm the divinely-revealed truths, its *exercise can but* be consonant with reason, the inward light of the Holy Ghost, and Sacred Scripture. The idea of any *clashing* between them is *absurd*, and can never enter an *intelligent and well-regulated* mind!"

We begin, at length, to understand the matter. The beautiful sentiments about reason, liberty, judgment, and independence, which so bewildered us a while ago, were expressed, we now perceive, *cum grano salis*. Every man was made by his Creator to do his own thinking—provided he always think as the Church does! No man has the right to surrender his judgment—except to the Catholic Church! Independence is an inalienable gift—but it must not be exercised outside of the authority of the Church! Into the sacred sphere of these heaven-bestowed blessings, no human authority may penetrate—but, mark you, the *Church* is a *divine* authority! No body of men may lawfully dictate to others their own private convictions; but then the convictions of the Holy Synod were *not* private; they, consequently, are authoritative, and "beyond all dispute"! The mind that could entertain a *thought* in opposition to the decrees of so holy and so general a council, deserves only to *be cursed*. Such a mind is not "intelligent" nor "well regulated." It is beyond the pale of true reason, and can be reached only by the potential argument of *anathema sit!*

In the light of such a commentary upon their own text, it becomes simply ludicrous to witness the efforts of Romanists in this country to hold up their Church as the great patroness of liberty. If this is what *they* mean by Reason, Judgment, and Independence, we have to tell them that this is precisely what *we* mean by Romish bigotry, intolerance, and persecution. And they should be told, in all kindness, that if their drugs are *not* adapted to the wants of the age,

and *not* worthy of being received, they will not enhance their own reputation by knavishly affixing false labels to them. For a Church which has ever been inflexibly despotic and intolerant, and which, from its very genius, must necessarily be so, to assume to lecture Americans, and especially American Protestants, on the principles of civil and religious liberty, would be supremely audacious, if it were not superlatively ludicrous. *On n'est jamais si ridicule par les qualites que l'on a, que par celles que l'on affecte d'avoir.* We commend this maxim to the author of the "Aspirations." Let him, if he will, advocate the authority of his Church—it is his privilege to do so; let him also insist, if he so please, upon its universality and its infallibility. It is not in our heart to disturb a fancy which ministers so copiously to self-gratulation and complacency. But we beg him to admit that these unsupported assumptions, as hitherto maintained by his Church, are inconsistent with any free exercise of Reason, any just idea of Independence, any manly use of Judgment. When he shall have made this admission, we may be able to honor his candor as much as we now commiserate his infatuation. But when he assumes, as he now does, the office of censor; when he has the temerity to charge Protestantism with opposition to Reason and Liberty, it is Napoleon complaining of ambition! It is Nero delivering a lecture on mercy! *Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?*

It may possibly be thought that our conclusion as to the Spirit of Romanism has been deduced from insufficient premises; that American Romanists, at least, will not admit its correctness; and that, notwithstanding the later declarations of Mr. Hecker's book may seem to breathe the old *animus*, its earlier chapters are clearly in harmony with the more Christian spirit of liberal and enlightened Protestantism. It may hence be inferred that the Church, either in its members or in its head, or, perhaps, in both, has harmonized, or, at any rate, is seeking to harmonize, itself with progress, with liberalism, and with modern civilization. If this be so, none will be more ready, as none will be more rejoiced, than we to acknowledge and record it. To determine this point we must ascertain, from an induction of authentic facts, 1. What Romanism *was*; and, 2. What Romanism *is*.

The reader who is familiar, as every one should be, with the excellent Church histories designated at the head of this article, or

with others of similar character, may be presumed to have a just and accurate conception of what Romanism was. By the aid of these authorities he has doubtless traced the causes, arising both in the Church and in the State, which concurred in its production and development. On this point we would particularly recommend the *History of Romanism*, by Dr. Dowling. Though not altogether free from a certain tone of partisanship, which we think detracts from it as a work of history, it is, nevertheless, exceedingly valuable to the general reader, especially for the many decrees and canons of different councils which it quotes, and for other facts and documents not elsewhere so readily accessible.

These impartial historians are singularly careful that their readers shall never lose sight of the elements of truth retained by the Church during all the successive periods of its spiritual declension; nor yet of the many works of mercy and benevolence which, in ages of darkness and inhumanity, she was the instrument of accomplishing. They do not, however, as, indeed, they could not, conceal the fact that these truths became gradually more and more obscured by a superincumbent and ever-increasing mass of superstition and falsehood. Nor is it any fault of these writers if the good works which they so kindly and so fully portray, are rendered unduly prominent by the dark ground of intolerance, oppression, and blood upon which they were obliged by the truth to paint them.

We are not surprised to find that what came finally to be known and designated by all intelligent Scripturists as the Great Apostasy, was the result of a *succession* of apostasies; or, as we might express it, the terminus of ages of downward progress. This was natural, and might have been expected. *Nemo repente fuit turpissimus*. But we could not have anticipated the fact that the pretensions of the Church at each successive stage of its declension would be, without exception, inversely as her doctrinal and spiritual merits. It required her history to disclose, as it does, a phenomenon so astounding. She had, for example, gone far into corruption and worldly lusts before she assumed, as her organic designation, the title "Holy." It was not until Neo-Platonism and other false philosophies and speculations had so corrupted her faith as to drive out of her communion, and back to the Gospel, the purest and best of her members, that she became, *par excellence*, the "Catholic" Church. And so it was,

after Pagan rites and idolatrous ritualism had supplanted the few and simple ceremonies of the Apostles, that she proclaimed herself "Apostolic." She pretended, too, to fill the *office* and to wield the *authority* of the Apostles—but not until lust, ambition, and strife had driven forever from her bosom the Holy Spirit which had animated and guided them. Thus, step by step, she continued to go down from the lofty position of truth and purity occupied by the Primitive Church, increasing her pretensions as she lost her graces, until at last the amazing spectacle was exhibited before God and men of a worshiper of idols and an adorer of saints claiming to be the Vicar of Christ and the Father of His Church Universal!

Spiritual degradation could descend no lower—spiritual presumption and arrogance could ascend no higher. It needed now but the master mind of Hildebrand to assert and to maintain that as "the Holy See has *absolute power* over all spiritual things, why should it not also rule temporal affairs? God reigns in the heavens—*his Vicar should reign over all the earth*"—and Romanism was complete!

We have now reached a point in this rapid survey at which we may profitably pause for a moment, to inquire what must necessarily be the attitude to the world and to the Church of a Hierarchy pretending to such authority as this. Can it foster individual liberty? Can it encourage the exercise of reason? Can it tolerate freedom of conscience? Can it permit a word, or even a thought, in opposition to itself? No sensible man believes that it can. No one of even ordinary intelligence can fairly and candidly consider the meaning of these claims without perceiving that they are essentially and absolutely opposed to human freedom; that they can not be harmonized with liberty, because, by their very terms, they antagonize it. They assert *absolute power* over all spiritual matters; and this, be the claim right or wrong, is neither less nor more than despotism.

These lofty pretensions may indeed have been abandoned—we do not in this place inquire into that matter—but we do wish to say, here and now, that unless the present Pope of Rome clearly and unambiguously *disclaims* and *renounces* them—not simply as being impolitic, but because they are unlawful and unrighteous—then whoever seeks to commend Romanism to Americans as the patron of freedom, offers an insult to their intelligence and an imposition to their credulity.

Our readers should not fail to observe, also, the logical consequence deduced by Hildebrand from the assumed nature of his office. He asserted that the Pope, as the Vicar of Christ, had the right to reign over all the earth, and that his power was equally absolute over temporal as over spiritual matters. In this he was consistent. For, if the Pope really occupies the place of God upon earth; if he actually and truly fills the office of Jesus Christ by Divine right and appointment, as every Romanist believes, then he is not only head of the Church, but "head over all things for the Church;" not only Shepherd and Bishop of souls, but "King of kings and Lord of lords." He has the right, absolutely and indefeasibly, by grant Divine, to change times and laws, to destroy constitutions, to make and unmake kings and emperors—in one word, to "*reign over all the earth.*" Popes have asserted this right, in these very words, as *infallible* truth; they have repeatedly acted upon it as an established and recognized principle; and we know that it is involved logically and necessarily in one of the cardinal items of Romish faith. Whoever, therefore, believes that the Pope is the Vicar of Christ, must either stultify himself or believe, at the same time, that he has the supremacy, both temporal and spiritual, over the whole world.

Still we will not pertinaciously insist upon the logical consequences of this doctrine if they shall be disclaimed—not by Romanists, but by Rome; not by Churchmen, but by the Church; not by Papists, but by the Pope. Let the authority which sets them aside be equal at least to that which established them. We care not that Gregory VII excommunicated Henry IV, and absolved his subjects from their oath of allegiance. We are quite willing to believe that in this he exceeded the limits of his authority—provided the reigning Pope will but tell us so! That Innocent III excommunicated Otho, deposed King John, and bestowed the kingdom of England upon France, as Adrian had given Ireland to England, is nothing but pleasant reading—if only we can be assured by Pius IX that his predecessors, in performing these acts, transcended the limits of their rightful authority. But if it shall be found that he indorse and approve them all, then the case becomes totally different; then, indeed, these acts of his predecessors are as full of significance and warning as if they had been done by himself.

We open now the last Syllabus of the reigning Pontiff, and read as an *error condemned*, the following :

"The Roman Pontiffs and the Œcumenical Councils have *exceeded the limits of their power, usurped the rights of princes*, and erred even in the definition of matters of faith and morals." (Syllabus, xxiii.)

Nothing could be plainer. This language is clearly equivalent to a distinct and positive re-assertion of the rightfulness and legitimacy of the most arrogant claims and imperial acts of Gregory VII, of Innocent III, and of Sixtus V. These Pontiffs never exceeded the limits of their power; they never usurped the rights of princes! Pius IX will not certainly depose Victoria, as his predecessor deposed John; he will not sell the United States to Spain, as Clement sold Sicily to Charles of Anjou—but he asserts, none the less positively, his *right* to do it if he could. The *spirit* is willing; it is the flesh only that is weak.

Our readers may feel curious to know how such a *dictum* of the Sovereign Pontiff is received by his subjects in America. Do they approve, or condemn it? Inharmonious as it manifestly is with our institutions and with all our ideas of human rights and privileges, the question is grave and important. Do they receive it coldly? Do they accept it with abatement? Do they regret to see such a spirit exhibited? such despotism justified? such lawless usurpation legalized? Would that we could say so! But, so far from it, the Archbishop of Cincinnati, who stands high on the roll of Roman fame, and who may safely be regarded as a representative man among American Catholics, expresses himself thus, concerning the very Syllabus from which we have quoted :

"We receive it *implicitly*, we bow to it *reverently*, we embrace it *cordially*, we hail it *gratefully*. TO US IT IS AS THE VOICE OF GOD ON SINAI, ON THE JORDAN, ON THEBOR!"

After such an indorsement it will be proper for us to examine the matter yet more narrowly. We notice that not only the Roman Pontiffs, but also the Œcumenical Councils, have never, in a single instance, exceeded the limits of their power. This being so, we direct attention to a decree of one of these Councils, presided over by a Roman Pontiff, and therefore clearly embraced by the approbatory

dictum of the Syllabus. This decree will manifest as plainly as any fact we could produce the spirit of Romanism *as it was*; while the Syllabus will give to it all the sanction of Romanism *as it is*. We refer, as may have been anticipated, to the Fourth Council of Lateran, and its decree for the *extirpation of heretics*. It says:

"We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy extolling itself against this holy, orthodox, Catholic faith, which we before expounded, *condemning all heretics*, by what names soever called. And being condemned, let them be left to the secular power, or to their bailiffs, *to be punished* by due animadversion."

This sounds very little like American freedom of conscience, even as it stands; but if the matter paused here it would be comparatively innocent. It might be said that the Church condemns the heresy and the heretic, but she does not invade the heretic's liberty. She simply *leaves* him to the secular power. If that *punishes* him, it is no concern of hers. *She* does not do it. In the same way she washes her hands of all the Inquisitorial blood that was shed. It was no act of hers; it was the "secular power" that did it all. It hence becomes important to quote further upon this point. The Council proceeds to decree:

"And let the secular powers be *warned and induced*, and, if need be, condemned by ecclesiastical censure, what offices soever they are in, that as they desire to be reputed and taken for believers, so they *publicly take an oath* for the defense of the faith, that they will study in good earnest *to exterminate*, to their *utmost power*, from the lands subject to their jurisdiction, *ALL HERETICS denoted by the Church*; so that every one that is henceforth taken into *any power, either spiritual or temporal*, shall be bound to *confirm this chapter by his oath*."

This would seem to be strong enough in all conscience, but even this does not satisfy the spirit of Romanism. It leaves a chance, a bare chance, we admit, but still a chance, that some poor heretic may escape with his life. It is just possible that some secular ruler, notwithstanding his oath, may stop short in the butchery of his subjects, innocent and conscientious as he knows them to be, before the work of extermination is entirely complete. He may have some bowels of mercy left. The spirit of the old Gospel which "blesses and curses not;" of Him who wept over obstinate sinners, but left them *free*; who came "not to destroy men's lives but to save them;" such a spirit may breathe its hallowing influence over his heart, and restrain his hand. Evidently, there is danger here. Human nature itself is

so much better than Romanism, that it must be stimulated to perform its unholy work. Hence the decree proceeds :

"But if the temporal lord, *required and warned by the Church*, shall neglect to purge his territory of this *heretical filth*, let him, by the metropolitan and provincial bishops, be *tied by the bond of excommunication*; and if he scorn to satisfy within a year, let that be signified to the *Pope*, that he may proclaim his vassals thenceforth *absolved from their allegiance to him*, and may expose his country to be seized on by Catholics, who, the heretics being excommunicated, *may possess it without any contradiction.*"

Mr. Hecker may be able to perceive in all this the fostering hand of a loving mother, tenderly cherishing and conserving the sacred and inalienable rights and liberties of man. His perspicacity is equal to it. Pius IX also thinks well of it. The Pontiff and the Council, so he avers, had the *right* to do as they did. They were clearly within the limits of legitimate power. If any man say otherwise his proposition is condemned as *error*. "Thank you, thank you!" says our Archbishop; "we hail this gratefully, we receive it implicitly, we embrace it cordially, we bow to it reverently. It is as the voice of God upon Sinai!"

Evidence, such as that we have already quoted, might be produced by the volume. The council of Constance, the sixteenth general council, solemnly sanctioned the decree of the fourth Lateran, and carried it into execution by the murder of Huss and Jerome. The council of Sienna, which was continued at Basil, commanded the inquisitors in every place to extirpate every heresy, especially those of Wickliff, Huss, and Jerome. Princes were admonished by the mercy of God to exterminate error, if they would escape the Divine vengeance.

But why should we multiply examples? A single one is proof conclusive that the *principle* of persecution for conscience' sake is recognized, adopted, and enjoined by the highest authority known to the Catholic Church. It is believed to be infallibly right, and therefore always right. Consequently, it is consistent with the system to make the decrees for the extirpation of heresy and the extermination of heretics part of the faith of the Church; an article, the belief of which is necessary to salvation. Hence, in the creed of Pope Pius IV, which is binding upon every Romanist in the world, and which every bishop and priest "promises, vows, and swears most

constantly to hold and profess whole and entire to the end of life," this article occurs :

"I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and *general councils*, and particularly by the holy council of Trent ; and, likewise, I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Church."

Such being the genuine, earnest, and solemnly professed faith of Romanists, it is not surprising that the ablest and most zealous dignitaries among them should attempt to justify it. We present a specimen of their reasoning upon the subject. It is from Cardinal Bellarmine—*clarum et venerabile nomen*.

"We will briefly show that the Church has the power and ought to cast off incorrigible heretics, especially those who have relapsed ; and that the secular power ought to inflict on such temporal punishments, and even death itself.

"1. This may be proved from the Scriptures. 2. It is proved from the opinions and laws of the emperors, which the Church has always approved. 3. It is proved by the laws of the Church. 4. It is proved by the testimony of the fathers. Lastly. It is proved from natural reason ; for,

"First, It is owned by all, that heretics may, of right, be excommunicated—of course they may be put to death. This consequence is proved because excommunication is a greater punishment than temporal death.

"Secondly, Experience proves that there is no other remedy ; for the Church has, step by step, tried all remedies ; first, excommunication alone, then pecuniary penalties, afterward banishment, and lastly, has been forced to put them to death—to send them to their own place.

"Thirdly, All allow that forgery deserves death ; but heretics are guilty of forgery of the Word of God.

"Fourthly, A breach of faith by man toward God is a greater sin than of a wife with her husband. But a woman's unfaithfulness is punished with death ; why not a heretic's ?

"Fifthly, There are three grounds on which reason shows that heretics should be put to death ; the first is : lest the wicked should injure the righteous ; second, that by the punishment of a few, many may be reformed. For many who were made torpid by impunity, are roused by the fear of punishment ; and this, we daily see, is the result where the inquisition flourishes.

"Finally, It is a benefit to obstinate heretics to remove them from this life ; for the longer they live the more errors they invent, the more persons they mislead, and the greater damnation do they treasure up to themselves."

The learned Cardinal proceeds to answer the objections of Luther and other heretics ; for, strange to say, they were not convinced by his reasoning, notwithstanding they were so clearly to be

"benefited" by its practical application. One or two of these answers may be given as specimens of the whole:

" 'The Church,' says Luther, 'from the beginning even to this time, has never burned a heretic. Therefore, it does not seem to be the mind of the Holy Spirit that they should be burned.'

"I reply, that this argument proves not the sentiment, but the ignorance or impudence of Luther; for, as *almost an infinite number were either burned or otherwise put to death*, Luther either did not know it, and was therefore ignorant, or, if he knew it, he is convicted of impudence and falsehood; for that *heretics were often burned BY THE CHURCH, may be proved by adducing a few from many examples.*"

It is not necessary to say that Luther had a different Church in his mind from that which filled the heart of the Cardinal; for this does not affect the significance of the *fact* stated and urged in reply. Once more:

"Argument Second. 'Experience shows that terror is not useful.' I reply, experience proves the contrary; for *the Donatists, Manicheans, and Albigenes were routed and annihilated by arms.*"

Facts and documents such as we have presented show conclusively what Romanism *was*. We have now to say that it has not changed. In the very nature of the case it can not change. If "full of cursing and bitterness" in the past, it is full of cursing and bitterness now. Its advocates and supporters in America may be ashamed or afraid to exhibit its true spirit; we are glad to see that some of them are; it may even be possible that there are those among them, better than their system, who would be willing for it to *be* what they are so anxious to have it *seem* to be. But they are powerless. The best that can be done for it, by even its most zealous friends, is to cover and keep out of sight its more repulsive and ghastly features. Even this promises but moderate and short-lived success. The face of Mokhanna is now so well known that it is recognized even *through* the silver veil, and when this drops, as, in the hands of unskillful manipulators, it often does, the very spirit within is portrayed upon the horrid countenance without.

Our good friend, the Archbishop, is singularly clumsy and awkward in the management of this useful article of ecclesiastical millinery. He is so possessed by the spirit of "the Dark Ages of light," and so anxious to restore them, that he sometimes gets confused in his chronology, and fancies that the world is still where he is, radiant amid the glories of the thirteenth century! In his hallucination

he scorns disguise. Regardless, alike, of Father Hecker and his "Goddess of Liberty," and forgetting that his Church is, as yet, only struggling for power, not clothed with it, he actually justifies intolerance, condemns liberty of thought, quotes Christ and the Apostles on his side, and so dazzled is he by the splendors of his anachronistic position, that he can positively see no difference between tolerance and approbation. "I ask," says he, "if the Church which *holds the place of God on earth*, does wrong when, leaving man to think freely, she forbids him to think badly?" Perhaps not. But what if the man knows she will *burn* him for thinking badly? Is that leaving him to think freely? When reminded that Giordano Bruno was burned in the city of Rome for thinking and speaking "freely," the reply of the Archbishop is: that "continuing to dogmatize and abuse the Pope as the 'beast,' he met the fate he merited." When the bloody deeds of an inquisitor, whom he assisted to canonize, are presented before him, his response, which he evidently considers conclusive and crushing, is: "*The instinct of self-preservation originated the Inquisition.*" The council of Constance and the Emperor Sigismund *did right*, so he assures us, in the matter of the Bohemian Reformers. After they had enjoyed "*full liberty* to defend their opinions, and these opinions were *refuted* and *condemned*, but unretracted, their *obstinacy changed their position*, and made them amenable as the open and avowed enemies of religion and society, to the penal legislation then in force." This is Roman Catholic liberty, as advocated in Cincinnati. Theirs was a "deserved fate," says the Archbishop. If he is right, every Protestant in America whose "unretracted opinions" the Archbishop fancies he has "refuted," deserves the same fate; and all would meet it, doubtless, were his power but equal to his wishes.

Let us further examine the ground of this "deserved fate," as set forth in the language of the Archbishop himself. "Huss, deeply tainted with the doctrines of Wickliff, taught that the Church consisted exclusively of the just and predestinate; reprobates and sinners, according to him, making no part of this society." No wonder he was "refuted"! At the bar of a council composed so largely of "reprobates and sinners," who yet claimed to be the "Church," the proof was abundant and overwhelming. But there is more of this heresy: "Hence he concluded that a bad Pope, for instance, was no longer the Vicar of Jesus Christ; that bishops and priests, living in

a state of sin, forfeited, of course, all claim to jurisdiction and ministerial power." Dreadful heresy! Rome could not endure such "pernicious tenets." The Church "forbids men to think badly," and this was thinking very "badly," indeed. Who does not see that the *Holy Catholic Church* will not survive a moment if you take away its "reprobates and sinners"? If a "bad Pope" can not be Vicar of Jesus Christ, what is to become of that necessary office? And, if "bishops and priests, *living in a state of sin*," are not to be heard and honored as the Apostles of Jesus Christ, pray who are? "Huss was condemned to the stake, and executed for his *seditionous opinions*, in 1415." Served him right, says our Archbishop.

Savonarola, too, "one of the most splendid intellects of the fifteenth century," was guilty of "thinking badly." This "proud reformer had rejected," says the Archbishop, "the advances of mercy, laughed at the thunders of the Church," (*Horresco referens!*) "persisted in his sacrilegious preaching, and *now stood in open revolt against the supreme head of the Christian world*." Mercy on us! We need not be told what became of him. "Savonarola suffered death. . . . A victim of his own ungovernable pride." The Church was not in fault, let us bear that in mind; the Archbishop of Florence, before whom he was tried, was not in fault; he was the victim, not of *persecution* nor *intolerance*, but of his own ungovernable pride.

But enough of this. We had expected to quote some expressions of Romish spirit from the *Catholic Telegraph*, but we forbear. Its evidence, fortunately, is not needed to make out our case; and we gladly avoid defiling our pages with its pollution. It will be more to our taste to present a quotation commended to us by the distinguished prelate who has already so happily and so freely contributed to our cause in this paper.

"As for eighteen centuries there have been no forms of civil society, no calms or tempests in the moral, political, social, or religious world, in which the Catholic Church has not been *true to the organic principles of her divine life*, even the enemy of Catholicity should admit—that fact being granted—that the presumption is on her side that *she will be equally true to those principles during the centuries that are to come*."

If this rhetoric, when translated into plain statement, means that Romanism is unchanged and unchangeable, it expresses the very truth with which we had expected to close this article. We believe that

the organic principles of the system; those which distinguish it, which give it form and vitality, and which direct and control its operations, are precisely now what they were during the ages of its power. No claim has been abated, no blasphemous pretension lowered, no persecuting decree repealed, no right of humanity conceded. All, without one single exception, are in *statu quo*. Through the infinite mercy of God to the world, the *power* of this despotism is waning; but its consumptive body is still animated by the spirit which, in all ages, has made it the arch-enemy of human rights and human liberties.

Society has changed. Protestant presses and Protestant Bible Societies—"pests," which Pio Nono "has often reprobated in the most severe terms," to quote his own language—have accomplished a great work in the interest of truth and freedom. The people have learned that *they* have rights as well as their rulers; that God's Word was intended for all, as it is addressed to all; and that a hierarchy which imperiously dictates and imposes its own faith, while it is *afraid to disseminate God's truth*, is condemned and reprobated by its own act. Those who cherish some lingering respect for Popery; who fancy that by some process, hitherto untried, it might, as they feel sure it should, adapt itself to an age of light and knowledge, of thought and reason, of progress and liberty, have ventured respectfully to say so. But their hopes have been crushed by an official condemnation. Deeply feeling that Romanism was at war with the spirit of the age, they have said that

"The Roman Pontiff *can* and *ought* to reconcile and harmonize himself with progress, with liberalism, and with modern civilization."

But this proposition, moderate and reasonable as it is, the present Pope of Rome condemns as *error*! By this he plainly says that he neither *can* nor *ought* to reconcile himself to the progress and liberty which characterize the age. He condemns, in like manner, the proposition that, "In this our age it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be held to be *the only religion of the State*, to the *exclusion of all other forms of worship*!" So also he condemns the provision of law by which, "in certain *Catholic* countries, men emigrating there should be *permitted* the public exercise of their own several forms of worship!" Thus, it is perceived, that the

very law which is the crowning glory of American freedom—a law which protects Catholics and Protestants alike in the free exercise of their religion, and under the protection of which Catholics are now boasting that in a few years they will become predominant in our land—this very law, the moment America shall become a “Catholic country,” will be found condemned in advance. And this by the *absolute* Sovereign of all the earth! Add but one more *dictum*, and the enmity of Catholicism to our institutions can not be doubted. If Church and State may continue rightfully to remain separate, the case would not be utterly hopeless. But, alas! his “Holiness” has solemnly declared that “the Church ought *not* to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church!”

This, then, is what Romanism proposes to do for us :

1. To establish the Catholic as the only Religion of the State.
2. To *exclude* all other forms of worship, not *permitting* them to be exercised ; and,
3. To accomplish all this by representing the Church as the true, and, indeed, the only friend, of civil and religious liberty.

We have only to add, that whoever believes this false representation must shut his eyes to the doctrines, to the claims, and to the History of the Church ; all of which demonstrate that the real and unchangeable Spirit of Romanism is now, as it has ever been, at war with the dearest and most sacred rights of man ; that it is the enemy of freedom, of judgment, and of independence ; and that, as such, it is unworthy the respect or the confidence of a liberal and enlightened age.

V.—THE CONNECTION BETWEEN BAPTISM AND
THE REMISSION OF SINS.

IN no age of the Church has she failed to assert the obligation of Baptism. So positive are the precepts of the Scriptures on this subject, so demonstrative the practice of the Apostles, and so unanimous the unbroken testimony of the great cloud of Patristic teachers, that no phase of evangelical ecclesiasticism has dared to so modify or change the uniform rule, as to admit to the privileges of the Church any unbaptized applicant for recognition. Whatever else they may have differed about, on this point they have been a unit. They have said, with one voice: Between the world and the Church there stands the "bath of regeneration." Whether it be the Jordan, the "much water" of Enon, the wayside pool on the "way to Gaza," the sculptured font of less ancient precedent, or the still later abridgment of the paltry picher—whether immersion, affusion, or rhanism—in all time, through all changes, and by all evangelical branches, baptism, in name if not in fact, has been held up as the one indispensable "sacrament," without which the hand of fellowship could not be extended, nor the rights of citizenship allowed. Differ as they might about the "doctrine" of baptism, they were unanimous in holding it to be a Divine requisition, and debate as they would about what is sophistically called the "mode," they had no controversy as to the duty of all to submit to it in some form.

If such be the place which this institution has held through all the centuries of Christianity, must not there be some reason for it, fixed and profound as the very foundations of our redemption? And what can such reason be, short of an established and recognized connection, of some sort, between baptism and the remission of sins? If baptism were an insignificant, a meaningless rite, a mere Oriental custom of Apostolic times, a thing of fashion, or an accident of climate, it would, doubtless, like the "salutation" of the "kiss," or the courtesy of "feet-washing," have long since dropped out of the fixed ordinances of the Church, and become a thing of indifference. On the contrary, not only has it been uncompromisingly maintained, but

upon grounds which exalt it into a *significance* and *purpose* that justify the high importance which has ever been attached to it.

We propose to consider these grounds :

I. HISTORICALLY ; AS THEY HAVE BEEN HELD BY THE GREAT REPRESENTATIVE THINKERS AND TEACHERS OF CHRISTIANITY, ANCIENT AND MODERN.

II. AS THEY ARE TAUGHT AND EXPLAINED IN THE SCRIPTURES.

1. Before introducing the testimony of the "ancient Fathers" on this subject, it seems proper that we should say a few words as to the authority which should be given to their reports of facts, and to their interpretations of Scripture. In no case can we regard their statements as inspired. As men, they were not only fallible, but, some of them, visionary and dishonest. They differed among themselves, and not unfrequently the same Father was inconsistent with himself. In polemics, they were often the merest partisans ; in speculation, sometimes the wildest theorists ; in dogmatics, frequently dictatorial and denunciatory ; and, as interpreters of Apostolic teaching, largely affected by the spirit of the times, and the corrupting influences of ignorance and fashion. Still, if we use them aright, they are not unworthy of our careful attention. One of the first distinctions to be made in studying their writings is that between their statement of *facts*, and their expression of their *opinions*. As to *facts*, their authority is, certainly, entitled to distinguished consideration ; for they stood near to the things whereof they testify, and spoke under the critical and vigilant censorship of hosts of hostile commentators. True, they sometimes pervert the facts in order to fit them to their arguments ; but, if we watch them as they are passed through the crucible of controversy, we can generally determine what is genuine and true. As to their interpretations of Scripture, these were, on many subjects, diverse and discordant. In such cases, they, of course, have no authority whatever. But where there is general or unbroken harmony, where there is no diversity, but the judgment is one and undisputed, linking itself directly to Apostolic times, and passing down with unchallenged acceptance through all phases of controversy, and with every variety of theorist, then it rises to the dignity of a law, and, though subject to revision under comparison with the supreme

and infallible standard, claims a rank in our criteria of truth next to that of inspiration.

In introducing the Fathers, then, as throwing light upon our subject, we shall estimate their testimony by this rule: where there is unanimous, or almost unanimous, agreement among the great representative men of the Primitive Church as to a fact or the interpretation of a passage of Scripture, and this agreement can be traced back to an origin, if not in, at least the nearest to, the Apostolic times, and without contradiction of history, or inconsistency with Scripture, then we must accept it as of highest authority, next to inspiration itself, in our judgment and faith.

Among the Fathers called Apostolic, *two* testify on our subject in language that admits of no ambiguity; first of these is Barnabas. He was the companion and friend of Paul. Luke says of him, "He was a good man, and full of the Holy Spirit, and of faith." (Acts xi, 24.) Tradition says he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel with the great Apostle to the Gentiles. He was a distinguished "teacher of much people," even among the Apostles themselves, and stood for zeal, knowledge, and inspiration, next to these authorized teachers of the Kingdom. His Epistle was written shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, while the beloved St. John was yet alive, and addressed to disciples who had been taught by the Apostles themselves, and who, therefore, could well judge of its harmony with their instructions. Speaking of baptism, he says: "It is written how that the children of Israel would not receive that baptism which brings to forgiveness of sins, but would institute another to themselves, that can not." Again: "We go down into the water full of sins and pollution, but come up again bringing forth fruit; having in our hearts the fear and hope which is in Jesus by the Spirit." (Ch. x, vs. 2, 14.) Here is the language of a man more conspicuous in New Testament history than many of the Apostles, accustomed to travel and preach with Paul, the chosen evangelist of the Church at Corinth, to officiate with him in visiting the Provincial Churches, and ordaining elders in them, writing to disciples, many of whom he and Paul had brought to baptism, and within a few years after Paul's departure, affirming a connection between baptism and the remission of sins, which, we shall show, is not only in harmony with the teachings of Paul as delivered

to us in the Scriptures, but also with the general voice of antiquity. What is the testimony worth?

Contemporary with Barnabas was "the Shepherd of St. Hermas." He was one of the brethren at Rome whom Paul salutes by name in his letter to that Church. (xvi, 14.) His work was written, in all probability, about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and was regarded by some as worthy of a place in the Canonical Scriptures. "Irenæus quotes it under the very name of 'Scripture;'" and Athanasius tells us, "that though not strictly canonical, yet it was reckoned among the books which the Fathers appointed to be read to such as were to be instructed in the faith, and desired to be directed in the way of piety." (Epist. Pasch., tom. ii, p. 39.) Origen, Eusebius, and St. Hierom have delivered like high testimony as to the estimation in which it was held. What says he on our subject?

In his "Visions" he is setting forth the building of the Church under the instruction of a venerable lady. He saw that the tower was built upon water, [baptism,] and he asked why? She replied, "The tower is built upon water because your life is and shall be saved by water" [baptism.] (Vis. iii, v. 42.) In his "Commands" he assumes to speak by the instruction of "a man of reverend look, in the habit of a shepherd." Addressing this instructor, he said, "I have even now heard, from certain teachers, that there is no other repentance besides that of baptism, when we go down into the water and receive the forgiveness of our sins, and that after that we must sin no more, but live in purity." (Com. iv, v. 18.) In his book of "Similitudes" he says: "Before a man receives the name of the Son of God he is ordained unto death; but when he receives that seal, he is freed from death and assigned unto life. Now, that seal is the water of baptism, into which men go down under the obligation unto death, but come up appointed unto life." (Sim. ix, vs. 152-3.)

Such are the statements of *two* eminent men of Apostolic times, as to the connection between baptism and the remission of sins. There can be no question as to the meaning of these passages, and it is remarkable how strictly they conform in expression to Apostolic style. Both of these writers had listened to Paul, and one, at least, had been a fruitful co-laborer with him through all his Apostolic life in proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ, and making known

to the people the conditions of their admission into the kingdom of the Lord. As the Apostolic teaching had been delivered to them, so they repeat it in these letters, and confirm the disciples in the "form of sound words."

"From the earliest times," says Hagenbach, "great importance was attached to the doctrine of *baptism*, because of its supposed relation to the forgiveness of sins." This is abundantly clear to every one who will take the pains to consult the writings of the early Fathers. The writers whom we have already mentioned show us what this doctrine was in the first century. The testimony of the writers of the second century, indeed, we may say down to about the middle of the third century, or, the death of Origen, is no less full and explicit. Irenæus claims to have heard Polycarp, and to remember, with great vividness, how he told of his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord; "how he reported their sayings, and what he had heard from them respecting the Lord, his miracles and his doctrine." "These things," he says, "I wrote down, not on paper but in my heart, and by the grace of God I constantly bring them up again fresh before my memory." Speaking from such a stand-point, we naturally attach great respect to his words. Illustrating the relation of baptism to our union with Christ, he says: "As the dry wheat can not become one mass of dough and one loaf of bread without moisture, so neither can we all become one in Christ without the water which is from heaven. And as the parched earth can not yield fruit unless it receive moisture, so neither can we, who, at first, are but sapless wood, ever produce living fruit without the rain which is freely poured out from above; for *our bodies through baptism, but our souls through the Spirit, have obtained that communion with the imperishable essence.*" (Lib. iii, c. 17.)

Tertullian was born in the latter part of the second century, and was one of the most prolific writers of his time. His works embrace a wide range of topics relating to Christian doctrine, and, among them, there is one specially on baptism, (*de baptismo.*) There are some passages in this treatise which seem to ascribe to water almost a supernatural sanctifying power. This is, however, simply the result of a too curious search after analogies found in the "cosmical and psychical significance of water;" but he rejected explicitly "the notion of a purely supernatural and mechanical forgiveness of sins in

baptism," and in his "De Anima" finely remarks, concerning the effects of baptism: "When the soul attains to faith, and is transformed by the regeneration of water and the power from above, the covering of the old corruption having been removed, she beholds her whole light. She is received into the communion of the Holy Spirit, and the soul, which unites itself with the Holy Spirit, is followed by the body, which is no longer the servant of the soul, but becomes the servant of the Spirit." (De Anima, c. 41.)

Clement of Alexandria wrote about the beginning of the third century. He was a man eminently spiritual in his views, and can not be supposed to have unduly exaggerated the importance of baptism; yet, so strong was his conviction of the divinely-appointed relation between baptism and the remission of sins, that we find him agreeing with Hermas, in thinking that the "Apostles performed in hades the rite of baptism on the pious souls of the Old Testament who had not been baptized." (Strom. lib. ii, f. 379.) This may seem a mere speculation, but it is one which had been taught by the Apostolic Hermas, and seemed to them both, no doubt, a legitimate inference from the Apostolic doctrine of baptism. Hermas, speaking of the righteous souls whom he saw come out of the deep and placed in the building of the tower, asks why it was necessary; and the reply is: "It was necessary for them to ascend by water, that they might be at rest; for they could not otherwise enter into the kingdom of God but by laying aside the mortality of their former life. They, therefore, being dead, were, nevertheless, sealed with the seal [baptism] of the Son of God, and so entered into the kingdom of God." (Vis. iii, v. 150, 151.) We introduce this passage, not for any worth it may have as to the subject to which it directly relates—for this is an "untaught question" in the Scriptures—but merely to show how clearly and indisputably the doctrine of baptism, from which the inference was drawn, must have been held, since it was thus made the basis of an opinion *so extreme* as to its universal necessity as a condition of salvation.

Cyprian was a disciple of Tertullian, and we find his statements concerning the connection between baptism and the remission of sins in harmony with all we have already introduced. He says: "The forgiveness of sins having been once obtained at baptism, we earn, by constant exercise in well-doing, which is, as it were, a constant repetition of baptism, the Divine forgiveness anew." He denies, indeed,

that water purifies, *as such*; "For," says he, "water alone can not purge away sins and sanctify a man unless he have also the Holy Spirit." But in this very limitation of its power there is an implied assertion of its true place in connection with remission. Again, comparing the effects of the baptism of water with the effects of the baptism of blood, he says: "In the baptism of water, the remission of sins is received, in that of blood, the crown of virtue."

The controversy concerning infant baptism, which arose about this time, throws additional light on our subject; but, as this was more fully developed at a later period, we reserve it for examination hereafter. So, too, with the discussions concerning the re-baptization of persons who had received the ordinance from the hands of heretics. We shall postpone the examination of these to their proper order, and proceed to the consideration of the appellations of baptism current in the Primitive Church. These were numerous, and some of them highly fanciful; yet, being significant of the effects and design of baptism, they convey to us very definite ideas of the conceptions, on these subjects, prevalent at that time. "Some of these," says Bingham, "were taken from the internal and spiritual effects of it; others, from the nature and substance of the action; others, from the conditions required in the receivers; others, from the external circumstances and rites observed in the administration." (Antiq. b. xi, sec. 2.) We shall consider only such as bear upon our subject.

1. It was called *indulgentia*, indulgence, or absolution. Thus, in the African council, under Cyprian, it is termed the divine indulgence. And in the Roman council, mentioned by Cotelierius, it was said that at the Easter festival, remission of sins (meaning baptism) may be administered by either presbyter or deacon, in the presence of the Bishop in the parish churches." (Bing. Antiq. b. xi, sec. 2.) Here we see that baptism was considered, to the worthy recipient of it, as the sacrament of absolution, and so named, because it was accompanied by the remission of sins.

2. Baptism was called *regeneration* (*παλιγγενεσία*), and the *unction* (*χρίσμα*). Tertullian says: "We fishes are born in water, conformable to the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, *ichthus*, (*ἰχθῦς*)."^{*} Here is

^{*} This is a reference to a well-known *acrostic*, formed of the initials of the several Greek titles of the Savior; Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱός, Σωτήρ (Jesus Christ, Son of God, Savior). The first letters of these Greek words make *ἰχθῦς* (*ichthus*), a fish.

a double allusion to baptism ; but the one which connects it with the new birth is that which we particularly notice. In Cyril's Catechism it is called the "*regeneration of the soul*." Justin Martyr calls it the "*water of life*;" yet not so as to give water regenerative power, for this was always referred to the influence of the Holy Spirit ; hence, with respect to its cause, or origin, it was also called the "*spiritual birth* ; whereby those who were born carnally to the world before, were now born spiritually to God." And because baptism was constantly associated with the divine operations of the Holy Spirit in sanctifying grace, it was also called the *unction* or *chrism*. At a later day, Gregory Nazianzen says : "We call it the gift, and grace, and baptism, and *unction*, and illumination, and garment of immortality, and lava of regeneration, and seal of character, and whatever else is precious and honorable." And St. Jerome, looking to this "noble effect of baptism," calls it (*Sacerdotium laici*.) the "*layman's priesthood*," in contradistinction to the clerical priesthood.

3. It was called *salus*, salvation, because "it was the means not only of obtaining remission of sins, but of bringing men, by the grace and blood of Christ, to the glory of the kingdom of heaven." Gregory Nazianzen, introducing a person pleading for liberty to delay his baptism, makes him speak after this manner : "I stay only for my father, or mother, or brother, or wife, or children, or friends, or some near relations, and then I will be *saved*;" the meaning of which must needs be that then he *would* be baptized, in order to "obtain salvation."

4. At a very early date baptism was also called a sacrament, and the *seal of the Lord*, the *royal mark or character*, the *character of the Lord*, and the *sacrament of faith and repentance* ; in all of which names we trace the uniform recognition of a divine connection between baptism and the remission of sins. As the Spirit was the internal, so baptism was the external seal ; and these were joined together in all true believers. The external seal of baptism might, indeed, through default of faith and repentance in the subject, be received without the accompanying internal seal of the Spirit ; as was illustrated in the case of Simon Magus ; still, the uniform doctrine was, as Fulgentius expresses it, that "no man shall have eternal life who is not here first turned from his sins by repentance and faith, and set at liberty by the sacrament of faith and repentance ; that is, by baptism." "When the ancient authors speak of penance and absolution, or remission of sins,

as a sacrament, they explain their meaning to be baptism, which is a sacrament requiring repentance as a condition, and granting absolution as an effect to all worthy receivers."

We have gathered these extracts concerning the ancient names of baptism mainly from Bingham's *Antiquities*; and they corroborate the one universal doctrine of baptism, which, we have seen, was clearly announced by two of the Apostolic teachers, and repeated, with unbroken harmony, down to the middle of the third century. Without faith and repentance it was idle and void; with them it was the (τελειωσις), and (τελετή), the *consecration* and *consummation* of regeneration, because it gave men the perfection of Christians and right to partake of the (τὸ τέλειον), the *telion*; which was the Lord's Supper.

Nothing serves to sharpen distinctions more than controversy. It requires the most precise definitions, and draws the lines of separation between truth and error with a precision that admits of no mistake. Heresy thus becomes one of the occasions of the clearest exposition of faith. The aggression of error strengthens the defenses of truth, and the cunning of its sophistry calls out into clearer affirmation the belief and practice of the Church. This has been emphatically the case with reference to the doctrine of baptism. Various heretical sects of the Gnostics, such as the Ascodrutæ, the Marcosians, and the Valentineans, either rejected baptism altogether, or so corrupted it as to destroy its identity with the divine institution of Christ. They placed all religion in *knowledge* or *spiritual experience*, and disparaged external corporeal symbols as of no account. Against this heresy, Tertullian wrote his book *De Baptisma*. He denounces Quintilla, a woman-preacher at Carthage, a little before his time, who set up to decry water baptism as useless, pleading that faith alone was sufficient to save men, as it did Abraham, who pleased God without any other sacrament than the sacrament of faith. He was fierce against the "libertines" of this new sect, and his zealous words are not unworthy of the study of some of our modern decriers of this institution, for we encounter a similar issue in the present age. This woman-preacher of Carthage has her modern representatives, and the necessity of baptism is decried upon similar grounds. In primitive times the doctrine was stamped as heretical, and this, most learned of the Fathers directed his great powers against it in one of his most celebrated works.

The *Archontici*, the *Seleucians* and *Hermians*, the *Manichees* and *Paulicians* all refused or corrupted the Scriptural doctrine of baptism; and it was made a prominent fact in the grounds upon which they were condemned as heretics. Their baptisms, where they admitted them at all, were put upon other than the Scriptural grounds, and because they either explicitly, or by clear implication, denied "that baptizing by water was of efficacy to salvation," they were denounced as "adulterate, pernicious, and wholly evacuating the true baptism of Christ." Hence it was determined, in several councils held in the third century, mainly through the influence of Cyprian, "that all heretics coming over to the true Church must be re-baptized." (Mosheim i, 186.) These controversies show plainly the clearness and tenacity with which the Scriptural relation between baptism and the remission of sins was held by the primitive Fathers; but the doctrine is still more prominently set forth in the later disputes which grew out of it, especially by Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa—all of whom composed separate treatises on baptism—and by Augustine. Gregory Nazianzen gave many names which he deemed appropriate to baptism, speaking of which, Ullmann says: "The following is the principal thought on which this abundance of names is founded: all the blessings of Christianity appear concentrated in one point in baptism, and are dispensed, as it were, all together in one moment; but all these names can only in so far be applied to baptism as the person to be baptized possesses the right disposition, without which none can enter into the kingdom of heaven." Gregory further speaks of a *threefold birth* of man, namely: natural birth, that through baptism, and that through the resurrection. The second of these, that through baptism, he says, "is clear as daylight and free, delivers from lusts, and elevates to a higher spiritual life." Cyrill, of Jerusalem, addressing the candidate for baptism, says: "If thou believest, thou not only obtainest the forgiveness of sins, but thou effectest also that which is above man. Thou obtainest as much of grace as thou canst hold."

But it is in the discussions on infant baptism that we have this necessity of baptism most emphatically set forth. This notion of infant baptism, in fact, originated, in part, in this doctrine of baptism. It furnished one of the premises in the syllogism, the doctrine of original sin the other. We may say, that, if the authors of infant

baptism had not recognized the relation between baptism and the forgiveness of sins, the inference of infant baptism never could have been sustained; and we find, therefore, that in every form in which the argument is put, this notion enters as a necessary premise. We have no more striking instance, in all the wide range of theological speculation, of the power of a mere logical inference over the faith and practice of the Church, than that which is here furnished us. With the unquestioned fact that there is in the New Testament neither precept nor example for infant baptism, with the unbroken silence of the ancient Fathers concerning it, till the time of Tertullian and Origen, (in the third century,)* yet this practice—of which Neander says, "It is certain that Christ did not ordain infant baptism," and "we can not prove that the Apostles ordained infant baptism from those places where the baptism of whole families is mentioned," and though it was opposed from the start by all the great zeal and learning of Tertullian—became very generally prevalent in the Churches, and at an early date, purely upon the *logical ground of an inference from premises, one of which was this doctrine of baptism, which teaches that it was for the remission of sins.*

And it is remarkable, too, that in the whole controversy, save where it is engaged in by heretics, no opponent of the innovation, even in the extremity and heat of controversy, ever attacked this premise. It stood unquestioned. The doctrine of original sin was criticised, the state of children with reference to guilt and condemnation, the possibility of other means of saving them, these and other modifications of the argument were resorted to, but no one dared to impugn the universally established connection between baptism and the remission of sins. Could a doctrine which stood unchallenged through such heat and trial of controversy, and which, if once refuted, would have

*The earlier allusion of Irenæus can not be admitted as certainly referring to infant baptism. The expression is *omnes qui per eum renascuntur in deum*, and the interpretation turns on the meaning of the word *renascuntur*. We agree with Hagenbach in thinking that Irenæus only intended here to "express the beautiful idea that Jesus was redeemer in every stage of life and for every stage of life; but that he does not say that he redeemed children by the water of baptism, unless the word *renascuntur* be interpreted by the most arbitrary *petitio principii* to refer to baptism." But should it be claimed that this word does refer to baptism, let it be remembered that it was written more than a hundred years after the New Testament, and at a time when some of the most absurd *doctrines* of the Fathers had already been introduced. It lacks the requisite of unbroken, unquestioned continuity from Apostolic times, and the sustaining harmony of Scripture teaching which we require in order to admit it to our respect in an inquiry like this on which we are engaged.

been fatal to one side of the contest, have had any shadow of doubt hanging about it? Surely, if Tertullian could have dared to deny this premise, he would have done it! He had only to say, "Baptism is not a condition of the remission of sins," and the syllogism would have been broken. "Admit," he might have said, "all that is claimed about original sin and the necessity of forgiveness even to children, yet it is not true that 'baptism is the only and necessary condition of salvation,' and, therefore, it can not be inferred that children should be baptized on this account." This would have been conclusive; but no! Tertullian dared not face the unquestioned truth of this premise, and, hence, he met the case upon other grounds.

So with later objectors to infant baptism. They never question the soundness of the position that baptism is for the remission of sins. When Augustine said, "He who is not baptized can not obtain salvation," no one controverted it; or, when he argued, "Every one is born in sin, and stands, therefore, in need of pardon. He obtains it by baptism; it cleanses children from *original sin*, and those who are baptized in later years not only from original sin, but also from actual transgressions;" they might form an issue about original sin, but about the assumed efficacy of baptism we find no word of dispute. When Ambrose taught, "No one ascends into the kingdom of heaven unless through the sacrament of baptism, 'for unless one shall be regenerated of water and the Holy Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God,'" none but a heretic ever doubted the position; and when he added, "therefore, he accepts no one, not even an infant, unless prevented by some necessity," we see how sharply the logical inference follows from the admitted premises, and how, without some qualification of the doctrine, when applied to infants, it was impossible to deny its conclusiveness.

Even the Pelagians did not dare to controvert this universally recognized doctrine. Legitimately, their theory led them to regard baptism as only of symbolical significance, and, therefore, a mere rite; but they preferred the evident inconsistency of dogmatically affirming the prevailing opinion of the Church "with regard," as Neander expresses it, "to the relations of the divine matter to the external sign, of regeneration to outward baptism," and sought, as best they could, to reconcile it to their theory, with which it was philosophically inconsistent. They preferred to encounter a logical difficulty rather

than dare to deny an undisputed historical fact. Thus Cœlestius, in the creed which he sent to Rome, says, "Infants must, according to the *rule of the universal Church*, and according to the *declaration of the Gospel*, be baptized in order to the forgiveness of sin; since our Lord has determined that the kingdom of heaven can only be bestowed on the baptized."

Some of the advocates of infant baptism were not content, indeed, to rest its necessity simply upon the doctrine of original sin, and this led to the invention of new virtues in baptism. The simple design of the institution soon became involved in their speculations, and it was not long till it was claimed that it had, and *of itself*, a *real regenerative power*. This corruption of the institution grew out of the over-zealous attempts of many to defend, upon rational grounds, this unscriptural innovation. Hence, Gregory Nazianzen says: "To children, baptism is a seal; (a means of securing human nature in the germ against all moral evil by the higher principle of life communicated to it; for adults it is, moreover, the forgiveness of sin and the restoration of the image degraded and lost by transgression." (Orat. 40, f. 640.) "Chrysostom specifies *ten* different effects of grace wrought in baptism." Isidore, of Pelusium, says it can not be denied that infants should be baptized to cleanse them from the sin transmitted through Adam, but this is not the only reason; it imparted to them a divine regeneration, adoption, justification, fellowship with the Church. The remedy was far more than removal of mere evil. Theodore, of Mopsuestia, taught that baptism, in the case of adults, had a twofold purpose; to bestow on them the forgiveness of sin, and to exalt them by fellowship with Christ to a participation in his freedom from sin, and his moral immutability. In the case of infants the first of these is not included, but they should be baptized in order to receive the new and higher life exempt from sin, and which all beings need for their salvation. The impartation of this new life was a preternatural influence wrought in baptism, but—he was careful to distinguish—through the agency of the Holy Spirit. So far as we can trace it, this acute thinker was the first to maintain that "the water, according to the comparison employed by Christ in his conversation with Nicodemus, stood related to the creative power of God in the new and higher birth, as the body of the mother to the creative power of God in the natural birth."

We need not follow this investigation through the Dark Ages. The scholastic divines adopted the mystical interpretation of the water, according to the allegorical system of Cyprian, and, of course, affirmed, fully, the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins. But, as suited to their habits of logical quibbling, they busied themselves, as to baptism, for the most part, about the kind of fluid in which it might be performed. Some thought, in no other liquid than water; others thought that air, sand, or oil could be used, while others held long and subtile disputes whether beer, broth, fish sauce, mead, or honey-water, lye, or rose-water might be used instead of pure water.

Having, then, brought our investigations down to a period when the writings of the Fathers become a muddy stream, mingled with so many corruptions and silly quibbles that they are of but little worth upon any question, let us pass on to the period of the Reformation. Let it be noted, however, that through even the Dark Ages, whatever *new* notions were attached to baptism, this, of its relation to the forgiveness of sins, was never denied or omitted. It was always held, to use the language of Cœlestius, "*to be the rule of the universal Church, and according to the declaration of the Gospel, that baptism was for the remission of sins.*" In the times nearest to the Apostles, this doctrine was taken in its simplest and most practical sense. It was understood that the forgiveness of sins was all a matter of divine mercy and favor, and that, as a law, purely of divine appointment, it was conditioned on faith, repentance, and baptism. This was preached and accepted without any philosophical speculation as to the precise metaphysical sense of the expression. It was accepted as a plain *law* of pardon, the reason or rationale of which the subject did not concern himself particularly about. No matter about the why and the wherefore; it was the Lord's appointed way to salvation, and that was enough. By full conformity to it the sinner was taught that his sins would be forgiven; without it, he was taught they would not be forgiven. It was the "consummation of his change, of his passage from death to life, and, as such, completed his *regeneration.*" Gradually, men began to draw inferences from this command. They philosophized and speculated; and, out of these, the simplicity of the divine arrangement was destroyed, the purity of the truth was corrupted, and the enormous errors of infant baptism and its consequent assumption of *regenerative efficacy in the water of*

baptism grew into acceptance, and, finally, fixed themselves in a theology which, in the practice of infant baptism, has resisted the honest opposition of a pure interpretation of the Word for sixteen centuries.

When Christianity emerged from the Dark Ages it found the doctrine of baptism involved in the greatest superstition by the Roman Catholics. Like all her seven *sacraments*, the Church of Rome taught that baptism had the effect of "imprinting a character upon the soul, which they defined to be a physical quality, that is supernatural and spiritual;" that it "carried along with it such a divine virtue that by the very receiving of it (the *opus operatum*) it is conveyed to the souls of them to whom it is applied;" so that, though one should be in his last agonies, very near past all sense, and incapable of joining any lively acts of his mind with the sacraments, yet would he be justified by them. This is to attach *saving efficacy to the water*; this is "baptismal regeneration," of which we hear so much reckless assertion, often by those who do not understand what is meant by the expression. It is not only without any foundation in Scripture, but is subversive of all true religion, since it tends to set aside the only true conditions of the Gospel, which are faith, repentance, and obedience.

Among the many corruptions of the Church of Rome, against which the Reformation thundered its denunciations, this, of course, was not the least prominent. Her whole doctrine of "sacraments" was one of the most objective points of Luther's fierce and heroic attacks. Her seven sacraments were soon reduced to three, and finally to two: baptism and the Lord's Supper. The doctrine of baptism was defined with great clearness and decision. The Popish corruption of "baptismal regeneration" was promptly detected and rejected, and, in the many *symbols* to which the searching discussions of the times gave rise, the true doctrine of the Scriptures and the Patristic Church was stated with a fullness and harmony that left no ambiguity on the subject.

Of all these *symbols* or *confessions*, that of Augsburg, as it was the first, so it was the most important. It is credited to the pen of Melancthon, but was based upon the previous work of Luther, and became the authorized doctrinal basis of Protestantism in Germany, A. D. 1530. It refutes "the Popish theory that the sacraments are efficacious '*ex opere operato*;' that is, by their intrinsic efficacy without

regard to faith in the recipient, or to the operation of the Holy Spirit;" but, concerning baptism, it affirms: "The Scriptures teach that it is necessary to salvation as a ceremony ordained of God; also, by baptism the grace of God is offered."

The angry contentions which grew out of this confession gave rise to various remodelings or new forms of confession, some of which were in fuller exposition of the Lutheran symbolism, and others, expressive of the views of Calvin. They all, however, are in full harmony on our doctrine of baptism.

In 1551 the *Confessio Saxonica* was drawn up by Melancthon for the use of the Council of Trent. On baptism it says: "I baptize thee; that is, I do witness that by this dipping, thy sins be washed away, and that thou art now received of the true God."

In 1552 the *Confessio Wurtzburgica* was composed by Brentz, for the use of the same council, and it says, speaking of baptism: "I believe and confess that baptism is that sea, into the bottom whereof, as the prophet saith, God doth cast all our sins."

In 1564 the Second Helvetic Confession was gotten up, under the auspices of a body of Swiss theologians, and became the adopted symbol of the Reformed Church in Switzerland generally, and by those, also, of Poland, Hungary, Scotland, and France. It represents the great body of Reformers who received their doctrinal views from Zwingle and Calvin. It says of baptism: "To be baptized in the name of Christ is to be enrolled, entered, and received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the sons of God; that is to say, to be called the sons of God, to be purged, also, from the filthiness of sins, and to be endowed with the manifold grace of God for to lead a new and innocent life."

We might quote other modifications of "symbolical" writings, of which the times produced so many, and to the same effect, but these must suffice. Let it be observed that they were written in opposition to the doctrine of "baptismal regeneration," yet, that they affirm, without hesitation or fear of misapprehension, the great Scriptural and Patristic doctrine of *baptism for the remission of sins*. This is clear from their face, and is corroborated by the more fully elaborated views both of Luther and Calvin, the two greatest spirits of the era that produced them. Luther, attacking the errors of the Romanists as to the sacraments, says: "God has preserved this sacrament [baptism]

alone pure from human traditions. God has said, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' This *promise* of God ought to be preferred to the glory of all works, to all vows, satisfactions, indulgences, and every thing which man has invented. Now, on this promise, received by faith, depends our salvation. If we believe, our heart is strengthened by the Divine promise, and, though a believer should be bereft of all beside, this promise, which he believes, will never forsake him. . . . In all his trials it will be his consolation that he can say: 'God is faithful to his promise; I have received the pledge of it in baptism. If God is for me, who can be against me? O how rich is the baptized Christian! Nothing can ruin him but his own refusal to believe.' (Daub. Ref., b. vi.) It will be observed how sharply Luther draws the distinction between salvation through baptism *as a work* and *as a promise*. It is *faith in the promise* of God, not merit in the work; but faith expecting and finding the blessing *in the condition of the promise*.

Speaking in a similar strain, he says: "This is not done by changing of a garment, or by any laws or works; but by a new birth, and by the renewing of the inner man, which is done in baptism; as Paul saith: 'All ye that are baptized have put on Christ;' also, 'According to his mercy, he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit.' (Tit. iii, 5.) For, besides, that they who are baptized are renewed and regenerated by the Holy Spirit to a heavenly righteousness and to eternal life, there riseth in them, also, a new light and a new flame. . . . Wherefore to be appaeled with Christ according to the Gospel, is not to be appaeled with the law or with works, but with an incomparable gift; that is, with the remission of sins, righteousness, peace, consolation, joy of spirit, salvation, life, and Christ himself." (Com. on. Gal., *in loco*.)

Calvin is no less explicit in his affirmation of this uniform doctrine of the great Reformers. Dissenting, as he did, from Luther as to the doctrine of the eucharist, he affirmed equally with him the Scriptural relation of baptism to the remission of sins. He says:

"From baptism our faith derives three advantages, which require to be distinctly considered. The first is that it is proposed to us by the Lord as a symbol and token of our purification; or, to express my meaning more fully, it resembles a legal instrument, properly attested, by which he assures us that all our sins are canceled, effaced, and obliterated, so that they will never appear in his sight, or come into his remembrance, or be imputed to us. For he commands all who

believe to be baptized for the remission of their sins. Therefore," says he, hitting at the doctrine afterward more fully developed by Socinus, "those who have imagined that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign as a mark of their profession, have not considered the principal thing in baptism, which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise: 'He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.'"

As he was careful to defend this doctrine against the loose notions of the Socinians on the one hand, so he was equally particular to guard it against the other extreme of "baptismal regeneration." He proceeds, therefore, to add: "In this sense we are to understand what is said by Paul, that Christ sanctifieth and cleanseth the Church 'with the washing of the water by the Word;' and in another place, that, 'According to his mercy, he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit;' and by Peter: 'that baptism doth save us.' For it was not the intention of Paul to signify that our ab-lution and salvation are completed by the water, or that water contains, in itself, the virtue to purify, regenerate, and renew; nor, did Peter mean that it was the cause of salvation, but only that the knowledge and assurance of it is received in this sacrament."

Thus we see that the doctrine of the various Lutheran and Calvinistic confessions, as more fully explicated by Luther and Calvin themselves, is at one with the Patristic teaching on this subject, and that the constant voice of the great representative exponents of the faith of the Church is, that *baptism is for the remission of sins*.

We pass over from the Continent to England. The "symbolism" of the English Church, like that of the Continental Churches, was of gradual formation. Cranmer and Ridley prepared "The Forty-two Articles of Edward VI," which were adopted by a Synod at London, in 1552. This was revised by the bishops of the English Church, under Elizabeth, and adopted by Parliament in 1571. It is known as "The Thirty-nine Articles." The twenty-fifth article is "Of the sacraments." It declares them to be two: Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In the "exposition" of this article by Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Sarum, 1698, he defines what is meant by the term sacrament. "A sacrament," says he, "is an institution of Christ in which some material thing is sanctified by the use of some form of words, in and by which, federal acts of this religion do pass on both sides; on ours by stipulations, professions, or vows, and on God's by his secret

assurances. By these we are also united to the body of Christ ; which is the Church. It must be instituted by Christ ; . . . for federal acts, to which a conveyance of Divine grace is tied, can only be instituted by Him who is the author and mediator of this new covenant, and who lays down the rules and conditions of it, and derives the blessings of it by what methods and what channels he thinks fit." These "constituent and necessary parts" of a sacrament, he proceeds to show, are found in baptism. He says : "In baptism there is *matter, water* ; there is *form, the person dipped or washed, with words, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost* ; there is an institution, *Go preach and baptize* ; there is a federal sponson, *the answer of a good conscience* ; there is a blessing conveyed with it, *baptism saves us* ; there is *one baptism, as there is one body and one spirit ; we are all baptized into one body.*" (Burnet on 39 Art., p. 245.) This article, he says, as published by King Edward, was more explicit than the present form in denying that there was virtue in the sacrament *of itself*, "not as some say, *ex opere operatum* ;" but, since the present form "puts the nature of the sacrament in the *worthy receiving*," he contends that it "excludes the doctrine of *opere operatum* as formally as if it had been expressly condemned." (Ibid., p. 242.)

The celebrated "Westminster Assembly" met by a call of Parliament, in 1643. It was composed of representatives of the Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and the Independent parties, the Presbyterians predominating. Its main purpose was "to settle the government, liturgy, and the doctrine of the Church of England." It sat for four years and a half, and held 1163 sessions. Both in the Catechism and the Confession which they produced, the uniform teaching of the Church on the doctrine of baptism is stated in the fullest and clearest terms. To the 165th question, "What is baptism?" the answer is explicit. "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into himself ; of remission of sins by his blood and regeneration by his Spirit ; of adoption and resurrection unto everlasting life, and whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible Church, and enter into an open and professed engagement to be wholly and only the Lord's." And in the confession (Ch.

28, sec. 1) it is said "Baptism is a sacrament, of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the Church, but, also, to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life." This is the language of the celebrated "Westminster Confession." It took the place of the *Confessio Scoticana*, in Scotland, and is the doctrinal basis of the Presbyterian Church both in England and America.

The Episcopalians are no less explicit. In their book of "Common Prayer" the minister is instructed to say, after quoting the Savior, "That none can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerated and born anew of water and of the Holy Spirit;" "I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous goodness he will grant to *these persons* that which, by nature, *they* can not have; that they may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's Holy Church, and be made live *members* of the same." In the prayer, he is instructed to say: "We call upon thee for *these persons*, that *they*, coming to thy holy baptism, may receive remission of *their* sins by spiritual regeneration." Then, after reading the Savior's conversation with Nicodemus, in John iii, he shall say, in exhortation: "Ye hear, in this Gospel, the express words of our Savior, Christ, that except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God; whereby, ye may perceive the great necessity of this sacrament when it may be had." Quoting still further from the Scriptures, the command of the Savior in the commission, as given by Mark, Peter's answer to the Pentecostians, and his strong declaration, in another place, where he says, "Baptism doth also now save us," he is to conclude with these words: "Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe that he will favorably receive *these present persons*, truly repenting and coming unto him by faith; that he will grant *them* remission of *their* sins, and bestow upon them the Holy Ghost."

The Methodist Church follows the Episcopal, adopting the identical words, and we need not repeat them. Since, however, there has been a controversy as to the precise sense in which the term "regeneration" is to be interpreted in this article, whether "in the same large sense as several of the ancient Fathers, or in its more modern

theological interpretation," we shall hear the explication which several of the most honored teachers among the Methodists have given of it. One part of the clergy of the English Church have held the doctrine of "baptismal regeneration" and the *absolute necessity* of baptism unto salvation, even for infants. Against this view there has been a constant protest, especially by the Methodists. John Wesley seems to have had somewhat confused opinions on the subject, yet, while to justify infant baptism he affirms its logical necessity, it is evident that he sentimentally rejected it in the case of believers. He says: "If infants are guilty of original sin, unless this be washed away by baptism, it cleaves to them." This is very like "baptismal regeneration;" still, it may be distinguished from it by a refinement of metaphysics satisfactory to some; but he expresses himself more fully in a passage which is quoted in "Doctrinal Tracts," published by order of the General Conference, New York, 1825. It says: "What are the *benefits* we receive by baptism? is the next point to be considered; and the first of these is the washing away the guilt of original sin by the application of the merits of Christ's death." Again: "By baptism we, who were 'by nature children of wrath,' are made the children of God. And this regeneration, which our Church, in so many places, ascribes to baptism, is more than barely being admitted into the Church, though commonly connected therewith; being 'grafted into the body of Christ's Church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace.' This is grounded on the plain words of our Lord, (John iii, 5,) 'Except a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God.' By water, then, as a mean, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again; whence it is also called by the Apostle 'the washing of regeneration.' Our Church, therefore, ascribes no greater virtue to baptism than Christ himself has done; nor does she ascribe it to the outward washing, but to the inward grace, which, added thereto, makes it a sacrament." This may be taken as a fair statement of the doctrine held by this eminent teacher among the Methodists, and, also, of the higher class of doctrinal teachers of the whole denomination.

Among later exponents of the doctrine of the Methodist Church, we know of no name that deserves to stand higher than that of Richard Watson. Commenting on the passage in 1 Peter iii, 20, he says: "It is thus that we see how St. Peter preserves the correspondence

between the act of Noah in preparing the ark as an act of faith, by which he was justified, and the act of submitting to Christian baptism, which is also obviously an act of faith, in order to the remission of sins or the obtaining a good conscience before God." Again: "The whole passage can only be consistently taken to teach us that baptism is the outward sign of our entrance into God's covenant of mercy, and that when it is an act of true faith it becomes an instrument of salvation, like that act of faith in Noah, by which, when moved with fear, he 'prepared an ark to the saving of his house,' and survived the destruction of an unbelieving world." (Theo. Inst., p. 630.) This is clear, and we presume is a fair statement of the doctrine of the representative *theologians* of this great denomination. Doubtless, there are some *scribes* in this, as in other denominations, that write a good deal on this subject, who, if not ignorant of the teachings of their great men, seldom trouble themselves to harmonize their crudities either with their own recognized theologians, or with the Scriptures. But we do not deem it pertinent to our purpose to quote from writers whose opinions are not of standard authority.*

In tracing this long and unbroken line of teaching on our subject, we have, so far, omitted to refer to the views of the early and later "Dissenters." We must now notice them. We can only do so very briefly. Down to the tenth century they are known in history as Novatians, Donatists, Paulicians, Paterines, etc.; afterwards, as Waldenses, Albigenses, and German Anabaptists. They have left but few doctrinal statements. There is enough, however, to show that they did not differ from the universally-received doctrine of baptism.

The Novatians took their name from Novatian, who was a candidate for the Bishopric of Rome (A. D. 251) against Cornelius. Defeated in the contest, mainly upon the ground of irregularity in his baptism, he separated from the Catholic party, with his friends, and is known in history as the "Schismatical Bishop of Rome." It is agreed, however, that "he held the same doctrine that the Church did," and separated only upon the ground of Catholic corruptions and laxity in discipline. "He was the first who publicly began to practice

*To these distinguished names we might add many others, who, with equal clearness, affirm our doctrine; such as, Gerhardus, Buddeus, Deylingius, Vossius, Isaac Ambrose, Dr. Fiddes, Gee, Dr. Waterland, Dr. Whitby, Bishop Wilson, Dr. Featley, Burkitt, Dr. Scott, *et multos alios*.

rebaptization, and upon the grounds: first, that baptism was necessary; second, that the baptism of a corrupt Church was no baptism. He claimed that he and his followers were the true Church; for the rest, they were wicked and profane; such as by baptism could cleanse no man unless they first did purify themselves."

The Donatists arose in Carthage, A. D. 300. When Cæcilian was ordained bishop of Carthage, they separated from the Church upon the ground that he was a *traditor*; one who had delivered up to the persecutor, Dioclesian, their sacred books to be burned. They regarded him as an apostate, "denied the validity of baptism as administered by the Church of Rome, and rebaptized all who left its communion to unite with them. In doctrinal sentiments they were agreed with both the Catholics and the Novatians." (Benedict's Hist. of the Bap., p. 8.) We have abundantly shown what the universally-received doctrine of baptism was at this time, so far as it related to the remission of sins, and may, therefore, conclude that *it* was held by both Novatians and Donatists.

The Paulicians had their rise about the middle of the seventh century. They agreed with the Novatians and Donatists in repudiating the baptism of the Church of Rome, and practiced rebaptization. Gibbon says of them "that in the practice, or at least in the theory of the sacraments, the Paulicians were inclined to abolish all visible objects of worship, and the words of the Gospel were, in their judgments, the baptism and communion of the faithful." Whatever heretical speculations they may have fallen into, here at least they stood upon Apostolic ground. We need not follow this obscure line of "Dissenters" through all the many names that were given them—we are warranted in believing, in most cases, by their persecutors—nor expose the fact that, through the sympathy of a common opposition to the Church of Rome, men holding nearly all sorts of opinions were united together, frequently to the discredit of their cause and the reproach of the large number, who were actuated by a lofty devotion to Apostolic Christianity. It may be said in general, that whether Waldenses, Albigenses, German Anabaptists, or whatever other name they may appear under, their peculiarity was a fearless and irrepressible *practical* protest against Catholic corruptions, infant baptism, baptismal regeneration, and the arrogance of the clergy. According to Twist, a Baptist writer, "it is manifest

from the Testimonies and Confessions delivered in that age—1100—they confessed that baptism without faith is *ineffectual to salvation*. And Mehring, another Baptist writer, explaining the saying of the Waldenses and Albigenes, that “baptism had neither efficacy nor power,” says: “This they meant of infant baptism; for they highly esteemed the baptism which is administered according to the ordinance of Christ.”

The testimony afforded by the teachings and practice of this line of “Dissenters” is valuable. At the end, nearest the Apostolic age, it is unambiguous and emphatic. As we descend into the dark ages it is less distinct, though in no wise contradictory. As we might expect, however, long opposition to the extreme of the Catholic doctrine of “baptismal regeneration,” and intimate affiliation through common persecutions, with all sorts of speculatists, gradually and naturally led to a compromise of the Apostolic and Patristic doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, and the adoption of vague and incomplete statements both of the benefits and the design of the ordinance. Yet in several “Confessions of Faith of the Waldenses,” this doctrine is stated with tolerable fullness. Perrin, in his “*Histoire des Vaudois*,” published at Geneva, 1619, gives us two of these. In the first, supposed to have been written about A. D. 1120, the twelfth article reads:

“We consider the sacraments (baptism and the Lord’s Supper) as signs of holy things, or as the visible emblems of invisible blessings. We regard it as proper, and even necessary, that believers use these symbols, or visible forms, when it can be done. Notwithstanding which, we maintain that believers may be saved without these signs, when they have neither place nor opportunity of observing them.”

In the second, referred also to the twelfth century, they say:

“The sacraments of the Church of Christ are two, baptism and the Lord’s Supper; and in the latter Christ has instituted the receiving of both kinds, both for priests and people.”

This is surely vague enough for Arian, Socinian, or any other latitudinarian sectary of that or the present age.

Sleiden, in his “*History of the Reformation*,” gives us a “Third Confession,” which he says the Waldenses residing in the South of France sent to the King to remove the prejudices, because of which they had been doomed to extermination. The seventh article reads:

“We believe that in the ordinance of baptism the water is the visible and external sign which represents to us that which, by virtue of God’s invisible oper-

ation, is within us ; namely, the renovation of our minds, and the mortification of our members through [the faith of] Jesus Christ. And by this ordinance we are received into the holy congregation of God's people—previously confessing and declaring our faith and change of life."

It is evident from these Confessions that the Waldenses were but little accustomed to use precise and scientific statements of doctrine. They make no attempt to conform the style of their Confessions to that of the Scriptures. They were, doubtless, bound together more by a common *practice* than a common *doctrine*. Baptism was held to be a positive institution of the New Testament, and must be submitted to as such, precisely as it had been commanded by the Savior. It was the immersion of a penitent believer—nothing more, nothing less. Rebaptization of such as had been only sprinkled, whether infants or adults, followed as a plain practical inference—and beyond this they did not speculate much about the matter. Speculative views were no bar to fellowship, where the practice was the same ; and among them we find the first formal statements of Socinianism. The Catechism and Confession of Cracow—1574—declares that it was published to remove "reproaches cast upon the Anabaptists." It is, however, distinctly Socinian. Its *fifth* article says :

"Baptism is the immersion in water, and the emersion of a person who believes the Gospel and exercises repentance, in the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, or in the name of Jesus Christ ; whereby he publicly professes, that by the grace of God the Father, he has been washed, *ablutum esse*, in the blood of Christ, by the aid of the Holy Spirit, from all his sins ; so that being ingrafted into the body of Christ, he may mortify the old Adam, and be transformed into the Celestial Adam, in the firm assurance of eternal life after the resurrection."

Here we have the first clear and distinct announcement of a doctrine of baptism, totally different from that which, we have seen, was universally recognized, from the days of the Apostles down to the great symbols of the Reformation, both on the Continent and in England. Instead of an act, which is performed with a view to the reception of the Divine pardon, promised in connection with it, and for the following grace of the Spirit, it is only a public declaration by the party that his *sins have been pardoned!* The conceptions are totally distinct. The one can not be made to mean the other—one is Socinian, the other evangelical.

Passing over into England, we find "Dissenters" appearing as Baptists. They were known, about the beginning of the seventeenth century, as General and Particular Baptists. The former were

organized, under John Smyth, in 1608; the latter, under Spilsbury, in 1633. These, for a long time, differed principally on the doctrine of personal election and reprobation; but in the course of a hundred years the General Baptists became divided, and rapidly declined in numbers and influence. They "tolerated persons of all sects." We find prominent among them such men as Gale, James Foster, Whiston, and Emlyn, all Arians or Socinians. Their Confession of 1660, as published by Dr. Whiston, was "so general and vague in its articles, that all Christian sects, with the exception of a few points, could embrace it." (Mos. iii, p. 218, n. 32.)

The Particular Baptists were Calvinistic. They were on the most friendly terms with the *Independents* or *Congregationalists*. Often both sects worshiped together, and were under the same pastors. In 1689 they held a General Assembly in London, and adopted a Confession, which is expressed very much in the words of the Westminster Confession as to doctrine, but in discipline and order it is independent, and accords with the Savoy Confession. The article on baptism reads: "Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, to be unto the party baptized a sign of his fellowship with him in his death and resurrection; of his being ingrafted into him; of remission of sins; and his giving unto God, through Jesus Christ, to live and walk in newness of life."

This article explicitly affirms a relation between baptism and the remission of sins, but it is ambiguous. A *sign* may refer to an act *future, concomitant, or past*. The last of these is the sense in which Baptists take the article, and this is not the sense of Acts ii, 38, nor the sense of the Westminster divines, from whom they borrowed the expression. While this Confession does not adopt the language of the Socinian Confession of Cracow (1674), it is interpreted, by many, so as to mean but little more than is taught in that heretical symbol. They make it a sign that their sins *have been forgiven*, or, else, they ignore its relation to the forgiveness of sins altogether; hence, in the Declaration of Faith published about thirty years ago, by the Baptist Convention of New Hampshire, this view of baptism is left out altogether. It says: "Christian baptism is the immersion of a believer in water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, to show forth, in a solemn and beautiful emblem, our faith in a crucified, buried, and risen Savior, with its purifying power, and that it is

a prerequisite to the privileges of a Church relation, and to the Lord's Supper."

This is, truly, a meager statement of this divine institution. An emblematic showing forth of our faith! Does this exhaust the teaching of the Scriptures on this subject? Is it in harmony with the unbroken doctrine of the Church from the Apostolic times? It drops out of the doctrine of the Baptists all allusion to the remission of sins, and to the new birth; and sinks to the level of the heretical views of the Socinians, which degrades baptism to the rank of a *mere ceremony*. It was against this "imagination" that Calvin said: "It does not consider that which is the principal thing in baptism; which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.'"

We have now completed the first division of our subject: The Historical Examination of the relation of Baptism to the Remission of Sins. From the first, we have seen it affirmed, without ambiguity or qualification, that baptism is that act of obedience in which we receive the promise of the forgiveness of sins; that it is the divinely-instituted external sign of the internal graces of pardon, in which the Lord assures us that all our sins are canceled by the blood of Christ. This Scriptural doctrine, as to the design of baptism, we have traced from Barnabas down through all the great symbols of the Church, and through the explications of all the great representative teachers in the Church. We have seen it defended against the Catholic superstition of *baptismal regeneration* on the one hand, and the Arian and Socinian heresy of a *mere ceremony* on the other. We have seen that loose and vague notions as to its design first made their appearance among "evangelical sects," through the influence of rationalistic heresies which sought to disparage the use of all outward symbols of grace, and so to reduce Christianity to little more than a philosophy of human consciousness, or the empiricism of sensuous experience. Against both of these errors the united voice of the venerated teachers of all antiquity comes down to us in earnest remonstrance, calling us to return to the pure fountains of all true knowledge of this great doctrine of the divine favor. To these, in another article, we shall invite attention; when we shall consider the second division of our subject: *What is the Doctrine of Scripture, as to the relation between Baptism and the Remission of Sins.*

VI.—THE LINE OF LIFE.

TO have a life of three-score years and ten miniaturized within the reach of a single glance, to have its dim, smooth unrelief stereoscoped into living forms and distances, and to have its beginning, middle, and end marked off and defined by a plain, simple, historic narrative in the Old Testament Scriptures, must be, when well understood, a matter of first-class importance to all who wish to comprehend this life below. Especially is this true when the picture represents our religious life; embracing our transgressions, repentance, baptism, trials, death, and glorification in the heavenly rest. The story of Israel's travels from Canaan, through Egypt, and back to Canaan again, furnishes just such an image of life. This typical sketch of life is the more important to us, as it not only marks, with clearness, the grand epochs in the Christian journey, but settles, beyond dispute, several of the most controverted theological questions of our times.

Before eliminating the salient points of this history, and showing their application to individual life, it will be scarcely necessary to prove it to be typical, as this is assumed by all writers and preachers as so plain that no lengthened argument is needed. It may be quite sufficient to refer the reader to 1st Cor. x, 6-11, where Paul declares that "All these things happened to the Jews for *ensamples to us*," and that "they were for *our* admonition." We are, therefore, authorized to seize the prominent features of that account, and make them parallel to events in the Christian life. The main facts to be thus noticed, are the following:

1. *Their going down into Egypt was a type of our going down into sin; the house of bondage.* In Canaan they were not in bondage; in Egypt they were. In childhood's innocence there is no bondage in sin. We do not affirm that Israel's state in Canaan was intended as a type of childhood any farther than its being a state free from bondage, and, so far as it goes, it refutes the old dogma of infant damnation on account of what is called "original sin," and shows that no man is in condemnation till he goes "down into" sin personally. We

are nowhere commanded to repent of Adam's sin, but of our own sins.

2. The children of Abraham received some temporal advantages by going down into Egypt; corn at first, and then the fertile fields of Goshen to live in. But Joseph died, and another king arose that knew not Joseph, and reduced them all to the condition of bondmen. So when sinners go down into their house of bondage, there is generally some temporary enjoyment, and promise of more. There may be temporary gain in theft, fraud, falsehood; and some temporary pleasure in drinking, debauchery, and carousal; but the land of Goshen soon becomes a land of bondage, and the sins that first enticed soon begin to enslave the soul, and convince it that every pleasurable sin concealed a baited hook intended for its destruction. It can not now deny that

"One day within the courts
Where my dear Lord hath been,
Is sweeter than ten thousand years
Of pleasurable sin."

3. Having once gone into Egypt, and having acknowledged some favors from the king, he began to feel their subjugation to be very practicable and very real. They not only had to bear the burdens already imposed, but greater ones at his discretion. Are not sinners compelled to obey their master as long as they are in the kingdom of darkness? Can they leave off service as long as they are under the taskmasters? Can they obtain a furlough? Does not the poor drunkard often feel his chains, complain of them, and then do worse than ever? He must now make brick without straw, and yet furnish the same number as before. Is not this a real slavery? "The carnal mind is not subject to the law of God, *neither indeed can be*;" that is, while it is carnal, remaining in Egypt, it can not serve God "in the wilderness." Moreover, let any who thinks he can leave off the service of sin so easily undertake to do so, and to join the Church, and he'll find the taskmasters at work to make the way more difficult than he supposed, and to convince him that Pharaoh will not let him go at once. Sin within and sin without, the pointed sneer, the faults of others, and a scarce believing heart, will all dispute his passage into the kingdom of God.

4. At this crisis of their servile sufferings, the Lord sent Moses,

from the land of Midian, to propose their deliverance, and to prove his divine commission by wondrous miracles in the presence of the king and all the people. Without this "deliverer" redemption for them was out of the question. They were possessed of no military force with which to break the yoke of their bondage; they had no money with which to buy themselves away, and so must depend entirely upon an extrinsic force for their deliverance. This prefigured the necessity of the advent of our Redeemer to this world of sin and bondage, to deliver the souls of men from the empire of Satan. Jesus, likewise, demonstrated his divine mission by "mighty signs and wonders which God wrought by him," in order that the bondmen might believe him, and be delivered by him. And just at this point all uncertainty as to the necessity of faith and the nature of faith is dissipated, as any one can see why it was necessary for Israel to believe on Moses if they would be saved by him. Their deliverance, without following him, was impossible, and their following him was equally impossible without faith in him as God's messenger. Moreover, their faith in him was strong enough and saving enough whenever it moved them to forsake the house of bondage and follow him to the sea, and through the sea into the wilderness. And whenever a sinner has faith enough in Christ to forsake the bondage of sin, and follow him on to his baptism, and through it into the kingdom of God—into the wilderness state—then has he saving faith, and not before. Nor is there any mystery in believing on Jesus more than in believing on Moses. Their belief in Moses was not an idle conviction that God sent him on a divine errand, but, as their own happiness was deeply involved in what he proposed to do for them, their hearts were interested, and, hating their old masters and his service, they believed on Moses with all their hearts. This so manifestly parallels our faith in Christ as to need no statement of the penitent's nausea of his former condition, of his cordial reception of the proposed redemption, and of the simplicity of that act of faith which casts all our care on Him that cares for us.

5. Before starting for the Red Sea each family was commanded to kill a *passover* lamb, and sprinkle its blood upon the "door posts and upon the lintels of the doors," so that the angel of death, flying over all Egypt that night, to destroy the first-born of man and beast—Pharaoh's last plague—might, on seeing that "blood of sprinkling,"

pass over such houses without harming them. This paschal lamb was one of the boldest types of the Jewish religion, and fairly adumbrated "Christ our Passover, who was sacrificed for us." The death of that lamb prevented the death of Israel's first-born. It, in a very important sense, died *instead* of the first-born, showing what Christ's death and atonement have done for us. He died that we might never die; "He closed his eyes to show us God;" he died in the world, not in the Church; in Egypt, not in the wilderness; and blessed are they upon whom shall be found his "blood of sprinkling" in the day when the angel of death shall execute judgment upon all who stand upon the left hand of God.

But here the hosts of Israel stand at the edge of the Red Sea in their front, Pharaoh's armies pursuing in their rear, and impassable steepes on their right and on their left. And here will we linger awhile with them in their critical position, before seeing them "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." If there is any fitness in this history as typical of things in the Christian dispensation; if Egypt represents our bondage in sin; if their baptism unto Moses represents our baptism unto Christ; if the wilderness journey was a type of our warfare from our baptism until our Jordan of death which bounds the heavenly Canaan; if "all these things happened to them for examples to us," and "for our learning," then may several important questions of our times be placed beyond the limits of reasonable disputation.

First. Is Christian baptism (to those who have a chance to know the truth) essential to salvation? This requires no long argument if the type is worth any thing. Was it essential to the salvation of the Jews from the hands of their enemies? Was their faith, and even their work, so far as they had gone, sufficient to deliver them? They had believed on Moses; the passover had been slain; they had formally forsaken the brick-yards of their taskmasters, and were standing on the shore of the Red Sea. Were they saved? Out of danger while on the enemies' soil? Or was it essential that they be "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" to escape a recapture into a worse condition than before? The true answer takes possession of the mind before we write it. Is it, then, sufficient for us to believe on the Savior—the true passover sacrificed for us—to forsake the practice of sin, and to stand at the very waters of

Christian baptism? or must we actually be baptized into Christ in order to escape our enemies, which are our sins? Is baptism, then, a non-essential, and are we saved from our sins by faith alone? Our answer is: "He that believeth *and* is baptized shall be saved."

Second. Do bodily acts of obedience to Christ ever discount the strength and value of faith? It is tacitly, and sometimes explicitly, assumed that if baptism be made one of the conditions of pardon of sin, faith is more or less damaged as a justifying principle—that faith can not co-operate with obedience in bringing us to the blood of Christ without being diluted, if not vitiated, by such company. But if the Jews had less faith in God or Moses after the passage of the Red Sea than before, it is contrary to the convictions of all intelligent men, even of those who believe in salvation by faith alone. Did they regard their deliverance less a matter of grace after their baptism than before? Did their walking through the Red Sea, as an act of obedience, win a part of the honors from God, and discredit the efficiency of his right hand in their redemption? All the principles of mental and moral philosophy, bearing upon this question, go to show that appropriate action expressive of our faith and feelings tends only to strengthen them; that when the inward principles and emotions are translated into open action, the one is never weakened, but fortified, by the other. Baptism into Christ can, therefore, never damage the *faith* of Christ, nor interfere with the grace of God; but, when properly understood and obeyed, co-operates with all other means of grace to develop our spiritual life.

Again: this passage furnishes a definition of the word *baptize*. The Jews were baptized, but the Egyptians, although drowned in the sea, were not baptized. Baptism does not mean simply a submerging, but includes the idea, also, of rising out of the water. But few readers have noticed that Paul, in Col. ii, 12, has given precisely this definition of the word as used in the Christian Scriptures. "Buried with him in baptism wherein (in which, *en too*) you are risen with him;" that is, in which baptism you are risen, the article *too* relating to baptism understood. Then it would read: "Buried with him in baptism, in which baptism you are risen with him;" so that the meaning of the word is not filled by a mere *submerging*, the *rising*, also, being a part of that meaning. The Jews, then, were baptized because they were not only "in the cloud and in the sea," but emerged from them;

a thing that could not be said of the Egyptians. So when we leave Egypt, following Christ our leader, we are baptized unto him by an immersion in, and a resurrection out of, the water, to walk in newness of life through the wilderness lying between this and the Jordan of death.

The *design* of Christian baptism may also be determined by this typical Jewish baptism. So far from being a non-essential to them, it was the dividing line between the land of bondage and of freedom; it marked the boundaries of each, and had to be passed before they were beyond the danger of re-captivity. As soon, however, as they had all safely placed glad feet on the other side of the sea they realized, not only that they were out of the enemy's territory, but saw, in their rear, Pharaoh and all his hosts struggling in the fatal billows. Now, as our sins are our enemies, this "ensample" shows that when the soul of the penitent passes from "the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son," it not only escapes the power of the enemy sin, but sin itself is destroyed, is forgiven, is taken away from that soul "as far as the East is from the West." It does not promise that his Christian journey through the wilderness shall furnish "no foes for him to face," but that all his *past* sins are remitted—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"—from his sins committed before that time; "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, for the remission of sins" that are past. Our baptism is not a mere outside ceremony for putting away the filth of the flesh, as a Jewish washing, but is "the answer of a good conscience;" which implies a deliverance from sin. From these passages and analogies, then, it avails but little for any one to deny that Christian baptism, administered to a proper subject, is included among the conditions of pardon. No mere transcendentalism, that seeks to commune with God without the intervention of Christian ordinances, receives any encouragement from these Old Testament types that were "written for our learning." Nor is that formalism countenanced which depends upon the mere ceremony of baptism, as administered to infants and unconverted sinners; since all the historic facts in the case go to prove that a preparation of heart was first secured in every family and every individual servant under Pharaoh—they felt their chains; were "weary and heavy laden;" they believed on Moses, their deliverer; they deserted their former master;

incurred the hazards of desertion, and fled to the Red Sea—all this heart preparation before they *could* be “baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea.” Without these antecedents *their baptism was an impossibility*. To call the mere ceremony a baptism is an absurdity. The baptism of an infant, therefore, never was any thing less than an absurdity, and the formal baptisms of unconverted adults in certain Church and State religions, for State reasons more than for spiritual blessings, is not only absurd, but thoroughly sinful—a mere husk; a shell without a seed; a shadow without a substance, and a form without the power of Godliness.

While it will now be admitted that the Jews were not baptized in form only, it may also be admitted that Pharaoh's attempt to be baptized, without due preparation of heart, was decidedly a failure. He attempted to be baptized as Israel was, but got only half through with it—he was buried in the sea, but did not rise out of it. The ordinance that was ordained unto life for those prepared for it was death to those not fitted for it by the necessary antecedents. The religion of heaven is the “savor of life unto life, or of death unto death;” and to venture, either then or now, to desecrate its ordinances is a fearful hazard to the soul. Whoever attempts to be baptized into Christ without the proper spiritual antecedents will both fail to reach the heavenly Canaan, and fail, even, of the wilderness state of the Church of God. Just as a marriage ceremony without a previously-secured affection between the parties is a graceless abortion in the attempt to unite a true husband and wife, so the baptism of an infant or unconverted adult is a religious abortion, injurious to man and offensive to God; and, hence, the mere fact that infants passed through the Red Sea with their parents, no more constituted a baptism for them than it did for the flocks and herds that also passed through, there being no faith in either of them. Were the flocks baptized into Moses? If not, Why? What was lacking to constitute their passage a baptism also? The Jewish fathers were baptized into Moses as their leader, their *accepted* leader, the leader in whom they *believed* as the sent of God for their deliverance; so that baptism could be predicated of no creature accompanying them that was incapable of trusting the deliverer. The application is easy, and needs not that we should say that none incapable of casting all his care on Jesus Christ can ever be baptized into him. Christianity

is a spiritual religion, demanding a renewal in the "spirit of your mind," and forbidding all drawing nigh with the mouth or the whole body while the heart is far from God. Such being the qualifications of a candidate for baptism, and such being its position between the land of bondage and that of redemption, it can not be a *non-essential*, but must be included in the terms of pardon and full reconciliation to God.

All we have said, thus far, relates directly to the salvation of the *sinner*, and his progress from the first consciousness of his chains until his full redemption from his sins that are past. Here we undertake to mark his *Christian* course through this wilderness of sin to the Jordan of death. The first great effort is to leave the world and come into the Church; the second is to live the Christian life so as not to fall in the wilderness. It can not be doubted that this latter introduces a series of tender solitudes "lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of us should seem to come short of it." The fact that many of them fell in the wilderness, is very suggestive of our danger. Those who fell had, in the first instance, believed on Moses, had boldly left Egypt, had been baptized aright, had escaped their enemies, and had entered on their Church life in "the congregation in the wilderness," but fell because they did not continue in the faith. "With whom was he grieved forty years? Was it not with them who believed not, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness?" "Take heed, therefore, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God."

To point this exhortation with incident, and to develop the salient analogies found in these "ensamples," the following specifications may be made:

1. Soon after their entrance into the wilderness many a heart turned back to Egypt, longing for its flesh-pots, leeks, and onions. Their circumstances were all new and untried. They did not feel settled fairly in their new relations. The change was very great and sudden; the desert dry and barren; Canaan was not in view, while Egypt was not far off, and it was natural for them to prefer a certainty, even if not so pleasant, to the unknown dangers and trials of the wilderness.

Those ministers whose hearts have been most tenderly in sympathy with young converts, and who have most intimately known their

experiences of hopes, and fears, and temptations, well know what is meant when I say that very often those who have just come into the kingdom of God, the Church in the wilderness, after a few weeks or months have their spiritual trials, their discouragements, their spiritual conflicts, in which they greatly need the confidence, counsel, and spiritual acquaintance of pastors or other spiritual helpers to show them the riches of their inheritance, to teach them to pray, and to comfort their hearts. Even in the marriage relation a little time is required for the young husband and wife to become so accustomed to each other, and so adjusted to their new relation, that they can *feel* the lasting relation to be nearer and dearer than father or mother. A little time must be thrown between their single and married state before they realize that an impassable gulf lies between them and their single state with their parents. The analogous period in the young Christian's life needs especial care on the part of the ministry. Leave them not standing on the shore of the Red Sea; start them over the desert; visit them; start them in Bible reading, private prayer, and prayer meetings of their own; let each one feel he has something to do in the vineyard; have them feed upon the heavenly manna, and drink of the Spiritual Rock; tell them of the land flowing with milk and honey; let them not imagine an easy, unobstructed road to heaven, but encourage them to fight the good fight of faith, and they will never fall, but so "an entrance shall be ministered abundantly unto them unto the kingdom of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ."

When the young Christian enters the wilderness state he must not expect this barren world to furnish him the food his spirit wants. Manna must come down from heaven for his daily bread.

"This world can never give
The bliss for which we sigh."

Can an immortal soul be satisfied with the praise of men, with riches, with worldly pleasure? After all the leeks and flesh-pots of Egypt will there not remain that "aching void the world can never fill?" When ill-defined uneasiness of soul is experienced; when unrest and lack of happiness, not easily referable to any visible cause, is felt, be assured it is simply a lack of spiritual food, nothing but soul-starvation, that can be relieved by nothing but a closer walk with God in Bible-study, prayer, active benevolence, and a holier communion.

And when ministers find members almost dying for want of the bread of life, let there be no scolding and upbraiding, but encourage and feed them with sweet manna from God, and you will lift up the hands that hang down, and the feeble knees. Teach them to pray *daily*. God did not send down manna enough for a week at a time, but only for one day; and the Savior teaches us to pray, "Give us this day our *daily* bread;" involving the necessity of daily prayer. This spiritual manna is supplied to those who ask for it all through the wilderness on to the very edge of the river of death. But, as manna never fell for them after they entered Canaan, we may expect that the Lord will supply our spiritual wants in heaven in some way different from that in this world. Of that we can not speak, for we know not what we shall be; we only know "that when he shall appear we shall be like him, and shall see him as he is."

The pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, that accompanied Israel from the land of Egypt to the borders of Canaan, represented the Word of God, which leads the way from earth to heaven. It was darkness to the Egyptians, but light to the Jews. So the god of this world "blinds the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ should shine unto them." Religion must forever be a mystery to those who believe not on Jesus. As the door of prophecy is said to be "unlocked from the inside," the light of the Gospel is seen by those who follow the Leader. "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrines whether they be of God." A man "must be born again to see the kingdom of God." The cloud was not only a light, but a guide. Whenever it arose and moved forward, the Levites struck the tents of Israel, and all moved after it. Whenever it stopped, they pitched their tents and awaited its further demonstrations; and those who move as the Word of the Lord shall direct, will neither fall nor be lost in the wilderness; but will reach the waters of death in safety, in the blessed hope of a resurrection on the other side of Jordan. And as the high-priest stood in the midst of the river till all God's chosen had safely passed its deep channel, so when we pass the "valley of the shadow of death," we'll fear no evil, for "His rod and His staff will comfort us." Some were young and some were old, yet Canaan was a rest for all, and if we die in infancy, "of such is the kingdom of heaven;" if not until old age, after we

have struggled long and hard for heaven, our rest will be all the sweeter for having fought our way through. And when the dews of Jordan have settled upon the placid brow, and we know "the crossing must be near," and the goodly land almost in sight, then

"Jehovah rules the tide,
And the waters will divide;
While the ransomed hosts will shout,
We have come! We have come!"

Three reflections shall now close this essay.

1. The Lord might have saved Israel from Egypt without bringing them through the Red Sea; for they could have passed around that sea to the north, through the *Isthmus of Suez*. Their baptism into Moses was not a geographical necessity; for they could have gone from Egypt to the Jordan without touching, or even seeing, the Red Sea, or any other sea. So God might have ordained that we should be delivered from our Egyptian bondage without being baptized into Christ. Baptism is no necessity in the nature of things, but it is God's ordinance—a positive ordinance—for the institution of which he is answerable to no one; for, if the thing formed has no right to say to him that formed it, "Why hast thou made me thus?" surely, the ruined sinner has no right to say to his Redeemer, "Why hast thou saved me in this manner?" All we can say is, that we find this ordinance on our way from Egypt to Canaan, and placed right between Egypt and the wilderness, and if we intend to go to heaven on the highway of the redeemed, it will be safer not to undertake a journey, without a leader, through the *Isthmus of Suez*; for neither Moses nor Jesus went that way.

2. Israel wandered about in the wilderness for forty years, during which time all the 600,000 armed men, save two, fell through unbelief. They might have passed through in forty days had they been faithful and obedient, as they promised at Mt. Sinai. But they could not learn obedience without those things which they suffered, and were unfit for Canaan—as unfit as many of us are for heaven while in our crude and half-sanctified state in the Church. It might be greatly to our damage to hasten away to heaven before we are ripe for it. It is not well to pluck green fruit. The Lord keeps us in the wilderness till we are weary of the journey; till our sandals are

almost worn out ; till we are anxious to leave the sands of the desert ;
till we

“ —Long to lay this aching heart
And painful head beneath the soil ;
To slumber in that drear abode,
From all our toil.”

Then will heaven refresh the weary soul with “Love, rest, and home.”

“Then shalt thou walk in soft, white light, with kings and priests abroad ;
And thou shalt Summer high in bliss upon the hills of God.”

3. Though we have not seen, as yet, our heavenly home, we have often received assurance of its glory, its verdure, and its abundance. We have also tasted of the grapes of Eschol. Moses and Elias having been over to see the good land, came back with rich clusters to the moment of transfiguration, whose sweetness so bewildered poor Peter, that he thought that mere taste of heaven was all he ever would desire. Sometimes it is given us to ascend on Pisgah's top to breathe from the gardens of God, and to see, through a glass, darkly, the rest that remains for the people of God. And having tasted of heaven, and loved it, and seeing nothing but Jordan rolling quietly between us and it, we can calmly await the call of Him who loved us, and gave himself for us. “And now unto Him that is able to keep us from falling, and to present us faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy ; to God, the only wise, be glory and dominion, majesty and power, both now and forever. Amen.”

VII.—MYSTICAL OR TRANSCENDENTAL SKEPTICISM AND WOMAN'S RIGHTS.

OF all the negative arguments which go to confirm the truth of Christianity, there is, perhaps, none more striking than that which may be drawn from the ever-shifting and contradictory attacks of Infidelity. Truth has, in itself, the element of immutability; while falsehood is almost sure to change. Hence, every advocate, whose business it is to sift testimony, knows *immutability* as a test of truth; or, at least, *mutability* as a certain test of falsehood.

The philosophy of Hume brought an objection against the miracles of Christ as being incredible; because they are, evidently, out of the reach of our experience; that no one could believe a miracle unless it came under his own observation. This argument is purely materialistic, and would expel *faith* from the universe if all testimony were subjected to the same treatment; for what comes under our own observation is not a matter of *belief*, but of knowledge. Hence, to use one of their technicalities, "the empirical Sciences" are matters of knowledge, and not of faith.

It is hardly necessary for us to say that Hume's position was ably refuted by Dr. Campbell, and many others.

The Old School of Skepticism always attacked the Bible in its external evidences—its monuments and history. But, since the discovery of the key to the cuneiform character, such a cloud of witnesses have arisen, from the ruins of Nineveh and Babylon, to sustain the accuracy of Sacred History, that the enemies of Revelation have been compelled to entirely change their tactics. Perhaps no skeptic of the French school, in the last half of the last century, could have been made to believe that Infidels of the nineteenth century would blush to use the sophistry of Hume. So thoroughly have all the old positions of skepticism been refuted that they are now obliged to make new issues, and invoke the aid of the Mystical and Transcendental Philosophy.

The extravagant theories of Geology, which gave the unbeliever so much exultation, are now tumbling down about the ears of these

Babel-builders. Skeptics themselves can scarce refrain from smiling at the credulity of their dupes, and, with reason, laugh at the weakness of those commentators who sought to accommodate the Bible to their pretended discoveries. But, as all we can say against these exploded systems of attack on the Bible can have but little effect upon the modern unbeliever, we will drop the curtain of silence over its ancient short-comings, and say of Infidelity, as Virgil said of quite a different character, "*Varium et mutabile semper!*" and draw from its history the consoling reflection, that skeptics have never yet found a tenable objection against the Bible—not one with which they can continue satisfied.

But, as we are now to look for the Bible to be attacked by the indirections of Mysticism and Transcendentalism, we must pay our addresses to this new method of aggression. True arguments are apt to improve with age, while false ones owe all their power to their freshness. Objections which but a few years ago looked formidable, are now ridiculous.

This new aspect of Mystical skepticism, as now arrayed against the Bible, presents some very interesting phases. The leaders in this new movement direct their attacks against the *morality* of the New Testament, and profess to *transcend* that holy book in the sanctity of their love for humanity. They profess to believe that the New Testament was good for the time of its promulgation; but we, of the nineteenth century, should progress far beyond its ancient and crude morality. They seek to incorporate their fancied improved morality with some great popular reform, so as gradually to suggest and introduce the notion that the Bible stands in the way of popular progress, and that, under the reign of Transcendentalism, we are to reach a higher point of happiness than was ever dreamed of among those who enjoy the peace and love of Christianity. They are entirely oblivious of the fact that this same kind of superior blessedness was promised to the Infidels of France before the great Revolution came and swept them away in all their dreams of fame and happiness.

But, in order to get up a movement of the requisite popularity, they have not scrupled to lay hold of some of the most radical principles of New Testament morality, and by leading off in these, and outstripping the Church, they hope to appear Transcendentalists indeed, transcending professed Christians in the transcendent virtues

of their own religion. It is but a few years since these men attempted to lead the antislavery and anti-war movement, and so cast the Church into the shade on the questions of liberty and peace, that they might treat with contempt those who are the representatives of that institution which should be the "pillar and ground of the truth."

But, not to turn aside to moralize on this gloomy picture of meditated fraud, we will call attention to what now appears to be the intended hobby for the coming canvass.

It has been the boast of Christianity that it has done more for woman than any institution of man ever contemplated. Not only is this elevation of our sisters seen by contrasting them with the women of antiquity, but the light and shade of the picture is still a palpable reality. To appreciate this we have only to compare pure, virtuous, intellectual, and holy women of Christian lands with those where the light of Gospel civilization has never come, and the contrast is like that of Paradise and Tartarus. What is it that has made this difference? What is it that has made our women but little below the angels, while theirs are but little above the brutes? This elevated refinement of the daughters of Christian civilization is no deception. It is a patent, incontrovertible fact. Could a delusion, a falsehood have effected this mighty revolution? And this amelioration of the gentler sex has a diffusive influence over the whole race. A refined, intellectual, and holy woman brings to her husband the blessings of progressive refinement. She is the competent instructor of her children, an ornament and solace to the society in which she moves, a comfort to the declining years of her aged parents; in short, she is the pride and joy of her father's household.

Now, all this blessedness is too palpable to be overlooked; and, since they see what the Lord has done for them, like the weeping penitent who kissed the feet of Jesus, they love much, because they have received much. One of the most lovely traits of human character outcrops in the sweet devotion of woman's heart to that religion which not only saves her soul from death, but her person from slavery, and has made her a priestess in the Temple of God. And a very efficient minister is she in the blessed work of human redemption. Her unseen, but not unperceived influence—the light of her beaming countenance in the house of God—her earnestness and zeal, uphold, extend, and render permanent the cause of Christ on earth, as no

other influence could. No learning, eloquence, nor official rank of manhood can do for the cause what is constantly and silently done by the sweet influence of maternal and sisterly piety. No priest, bishop, or potentate beneath the skies can do for Christ what the holy love and zeal of pious women are constantly doing.

Knowing all this, these shrewd schemers are setting a plan to work by which they hope to divert the devotion of woman's love from Him who has raised her from Pagan degradation to her present lofty position, and, under the guise of "Woman's Rights," to wean her heart from Him who has done more for her and the race than language is able to express. The impression is sought to be made that the Gospel of Christ is despoiling woman of her rights; or, at least, is leaving her without their distinct recognition. It is importunately urged that something over and above Christianity is going to do more for the sex than the truth, light, and love of Christ have accomplished in their behalf. Let this impression become a general conviction, and its results any ordinary sagacity might easily foresee. The infidels of France could not have accomplished what they did but for the co-operation of intellectual, but ungodly women. For, while it is true that virtuous, holy women have an immense influence for good, it is also true, that the opposite characters have an equal power for evil. Satan has never been so successful in corrupting the human race as when he undertakes to vitiate the faith and affections of woman's heart. It was in this manner he introduced the Primitive Apostasy. The Arch-Deceiver suggested to the woman that there was something in store for her vastly better than God had intended to give. Nay, he had even withheld from her the best means, perhaps the only means, of satisfying the deepest yearnings of her nature, and the strongest bent of her ambition. Thus her confidence in God was weakened, and she was prepared for disobedience; and the flood-gates of sin and misery were opened upon the race. So at this time. Let but the Satanic suggestion prevail, that the Gospel despoils woman of her rights, or leaves them without their distinct recognition, and her faith in, and love for, Christ will be succeeded by harrowing doubts and horrid aversion; and the daughters of the angelic mothers of the *nineteenth* century will become, in the next generation, such gorgons as helped introduce the French Revolution! It is not intended, here, to intimate that *all*, or even a *majority*, of the

advocates of "woman's rights" have any thing but pure motives. Many men and women of large heart and good intentions are engaged in this advocacy. But that the great movers of this progress—they who work the wires—are inimical to Christianity, is too patent to need proof, and that they are shrewd schemers who seek to rob the doctrine of Christ of one great element of popularity, is also too plain for controversy.

But let us here pause to inquire, What are these Women's Rights of which they are so cruelly despoiled by the Gospel of Christ? It is not to be charged upon the Gospel that women receive lower wages for the same quantity and quality of work. On the contrary, if these wrongs are ever redressed, it must be from the influence of a high sense of justice, which naturally inheres to the religion of Christ. No! in this particular there is nothing which involves Christianity; and, hence, it is not displayed with so much eagerness and interest. But the *right of suffrage* is insisted upon as the great RIGHT which includes all others; and this apparently, at least, because God, both as Creator and Redeemer, has put the woman under the authority of the man. "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord; for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church." To make woman an elector would be to allow her to rule over man; the very thing for which she is disqualified, both by the delicacy and compliance of her nature, as well as by the decision of her Maker and Redeemer. To invest her with the responsibility of suffrage would but add greatly to the burden of a life already weighed down with onerous obligations. To govern well, implies self-control, deep study, close thought, and great deliberation, besides the thousand and one controversies with which the affairs of public interest are always embroiled. To add these anxieties to the countless vexations of the wife, mother, and housekeeper, would be to give her a heavier burden of care than most *men* are able to carry. Few cares canker more deeply into the human heart than the cares of State. And must we turn these over to her whom, by the laws of God and man, we are bound to protect and honor as the weaker vessel? And for her to vote, without care or reflection, would be doing herself no honor, and no good to the commonwealth.

E. D. Mansfield, one of the ablest editors of the Cincinnati *Gazette*, proposes three questions on this subject, which should be well

pondered by every statesman and Christian. 1. "Will not female suffrage change the proper relations of the family? 2. Will female suffrage be useful to woman? 3. Will female suffrage benefit society as a whole?" As to the first of these questions, the answer must be, It certainly will! If you make woman a ruler in the State, her influence at the polls will be equal to her husband's, and what good reason can be given that she should not assert that authority at home which society has conceded she may wield in matters of the gravest public importance? And two co-ordinate rulers in one house would be like two presidents to one republic, two kings to a kingdom, or two heads to one animal body. Such misshapen republics, kingdoms, and animals are always short-lived; and so would be the institution of the family were all subordination taken away. "Order is heaven's first law;" but order without subordination is an impossibility. If we would have order there must be rulers and the ruled, governors and the governed. It is so in the State, the Church, and the family. And this subordination to legitimate authority is no privation of right, honor, or happiness to any one. The hand finds both honor and pleasure in being subject to the head. But if we could conceive of a hand that would insist upon its right to be the head, and should its ill-advised importunity be granted, it would at once lose both its beauty and utility, and become a frightful monstrosity.

As to the second question, "Will female suffrage be useful to women?" That woman could be any more useful or happy in any sphere other than that assigned her by the authority of Christ, is strongly akin to the logic of the Edenic serpent. God and Christ have put woman under the protection and government of the man; and he is taught to love, respect, and honor her, and in the sanctity of the marriage relation we are taught to consider her identified with her husband. This unity of husband and wife, this great mystery of human society, underlies all virtue, civilization, and religion. Any thing calculated, however remotely, to disturb this oneness of the marriage relation, goes to unsettle the very foundation of all true religion and civilization. And, could women be more useful or happy in a chaotic state of society than in the sweet influence of our present elevated civilization?

But again: all true government rests, for its authority, upon Wisdom and Love. Power is an element of administration, not of

origination. There is no authority in the universe except that which comes from superior wisdom and superior love. *God* governs the world, because he is wiser and loves the world more than his creatures can ever love him. Parents are wiser than their children, and love them more than the children can ever reciprocate; hence, *God* has put children under the protection and government of parents.

For a similar reason the wife is made subject to her own husband. He loves more, and should be more wise; and his greater physical strength enables him to carry out the administration of his superior wisdom and love.

There are, no doubt, many instances in which the woman is the superior in all these elements of supremacy. But is she the happier for this inferiority of her husband? If she bears rule in such a household, is she happier than she would have been under the administration of a husband of a head and heart superior to her own? The true woman's heart can only be satisfied with the love *God* has ordained for her; the pure, holy love of an intellect superior to her own. Without this, kingdoms, crowns, and thrones can not make her happy.

If ladies are strong-minded enough to rule over their husbands, it would have been a much better exhibition of such strength had they chosen partners who could have made them happy in the sphere *God* ordained for them. Where this is not done, no transposition of place or power will ameliorate their condition.

The third question is, "Will women suffrage improve society as a whole?" It is thought, by some, that the superior purity of woman would have a beneficial influence upon politics; but there is much more danger of that purity being tarnished than there is prospect of politics being elevated. It is not improbable that her purity of heart and life may be the effect of her isolation from this ignoble strife. On the question of Temperance she might vote differently from men, but the good that might accrue from such vote would be more than counterbalanced if this new regime is to transpose the details of family government. If its tendencies shall be to make the parties to the marriage contract more independent of each other, assuredly, society at large will experience no improvement; for marriage is the foundation of the social world. Any thing which will consolidate, purify, and elevate its union must have an effect upon society for good; but

whatever tends to disintegrate this unity, or introduce diversity of interests between husband and wife, can not fail to affect the community very disastrously. The more independent of each other the parties become, the less will they feel the restraint of the marriage compact, and the more lightly will they seek its dissolution. I leave it with statisticians to determine whether this be the cause why so many more divorces are now sued for, and obtained, than in former years. Are we beginning already to feel the influence of that scarcely emerging, but baleful star?

We can easily afford to invest our sisters, wives, and mothers with any privilege which will make them more truly happy; but having more faith in God than in the untried theories of men, we feel satisfied, as yet, that the New Testament philosophy of "Woman's Rights" is much better for all concerned than any transposition of things which could be forced upon Christian society. Under the policy of making the husband the head of the wife, society has progressed all the way from barbarism to a point of refinement and civilization which is truly encouraging; and we are still advancing. Now, shall we forfeit all our enjoyment, present and prospective, for the idle hope of outstripping the oracles of God? the hope of being better and happier than God intended?

VIII.—APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

HAVING, in former articles, shown the usage of the word *ἐπίσκοπος* (*episcopos*) in the Scriptures, I now call attention to what is called "Apostolic Succession." And, first, let it be observed that neither the word "Apostolic" nor "succession" are to be found in either the Greek New Testament, or the Common Version. Nor are the *equivalents* of these words to be found in either of these volumes. This being true, the *doctrine* can not be a Scriptural doctrine.

Webster says that "*Apostolical Succession*, in theology, is the regular and uninterrupted transmission of ministerial authority, by a succession of Bishops, from the Apostles to any subsequent period." The first thing required by this definition is "bishops." There is no word in the Greek Testament which means what the word "bishop" means, as used by those who advocate the doctrine of "Episcopacy," as contradistinguished from Presbyterianism or Congregationalism. There is not only no such word, but there is no allusion to such an officer.

There can be no legal succession in any case where the law makes no provision for succession. The laws of Jesus have made no provision for Episcopal succession, and, therefore, there is no such succession in the kingdom of Christ. The claims of Papacy and Episcopacy to Apostolical succession are without the least foundation in the Word of God.

Had Jesus said to Peter, "I give to thee," and to thy successors in office forever, "the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven," ample provision would have been made for succession. But, inasmuch as the phrase *and to thy successors in office* is not found in connection with Peter, or any other Apostle, they can have no official successors.

Had this provision been made relative to overseers, or bishops, then there would have been a foundation laid for Episcopal succession; not, however, in the technical sense of that phrase, for every body knows that there never was an "Episcopal Church" in that sense, until the time of Henry VIII, of England. This monarch, after having written a defense of Popery against Martin Luther, and

after having received the title of "Defender of the Faith" from the Pope for that service, caused a new Church to be organized, and placed himself at its head, because the Pope would not divorce him from his wife.

It is the consummation of ecclesiastical arrogance for that Church in England, or for its representative in the United States, to claim Apostolical succession. That claim is at war with all the facts of history which relate to the origin of that Church. The refusal of the clergy of that organization to allow the ministers of other denominations to preach in their churches, on the ground that theirs is the Apostolical Church, and that their ministry is the Apostolical Ministry, while all other Churches and ministers are spurious, is a compound of false assumption, spiritual pride, and religious bigotry, alike unworthy of the spirit and intelligence of our age and country. It is a ground of real satisfaction that there are many men like DR. TYNG in that Church, who dare to act like Christian gentlemen, and to rise above the Phariseism and the Ritualism which has characterized Episcopacy so long.

The Church of Christ was governed, in the Apostles' times, by Elders or (*ἐπίσκοποι*) *Overseers* in the congregations, and by Evangelists, who had the charge of the general interests of all the churches within certain districts. They had no Bishops, no Archbishops, no Deans, no Prebendaries, no Canons, except the laws of God, and no Ritualism. The public services of Christians sprang up spontaneously in the heart, and were modified by surrounding circumstances. The prejudices and lifeless forms of by-gone ages are passing away, and better times are approaching. Let us rejoice and be glad.

The second requisition of Webster's definition of "Apostolical Succession" is the transmission of ministerial authority. "Transmission" implies that this authority is conferred by one officer or person on another. He farther says that it must be an "uninterrupted" transmission; that is, an unbroken transmission. Not a link must be wanting.

This transmission must be "by a succession of bishops from the Apostles to any subsequent period." Now, the oldest Episcopal Church in existence was not organized till about fourteen hundred years after the death of the last surviving Apostle. That Church is the English Episcopal Church. How can a Church, the origin of

which is known to be fourteen hundred years after the Apostolic age, claim an uninterrupted succession of Bishops from the Apostles down to this day? The thing is absurd. It will not do for that Church to attempt to trace their Apostolic succession up through the Roman Catholic Church. The Catholic Bishop or Bishops, who left that Church to form a new one, were deposed and excommunicated by the very authority which made them bishops. The Episcopal Bishops and the Catholic Bishops are two distinct orders of men, and if the Catholics could trace their bishops in uninterrupted succession back to the Apostles, it would avail the English Church nothing. The English Church is not the Catholic Church, nor are the English Bishops Catholic Bishops. As well may those who came out of the English Church claim Apostolic succession through that Church, as that Church to make that claim through the Catholic. By following this principle out we will have Apostolic Succession in abundance.

The disgraceful origin of the English Church ought forever to humble its pride, and put a final period to all its arrogant assumptions.

The man who established that Church "was an unprincipled and cruel tyrant, and the chief business of his life seemed to be selecting and marrying new queens; making room for each succeeding one by discarding, divorcing, or beheading her predecessor. There were six of them in all, and, with one exception, the history of each one is a distinct and separate, but dreadful tragedy." Such was the man who established the English Church. How unlike an Apostle! With how little reason does such a Church claim for itself, or its Bishops, Apostolic Succession!

We are not blaming the Episcopalians of our time for the ignominious origin of their Church, but we are stating facts which they ought to know, and which ought to induce them to leave the organization, and to find a home in a communion, the origin of which is not covered with shame to Christianity, and even to humanity. Let the English aristocracy, who are, and have been, supported by it, support it in turn. But no American should have any connection with it, or any of its offspring.

That Church is the most Apostolical which comes nearest to the Churches founded by the Apostles in its teaching and worship. Just so far as that teaching and worship are departed from, just so far is a Church from being Apostolic.

Judas Iscariot was the only man, of all the Apostles, who can be said to have had a successor. He betrayed his Savior for money, and hanged himself in hopeless despair. He was one of the original "twelve Apostles" who were appointed as witnesses of Christ's resurrection. Twelve witnesses of this great fact being thought necessary, Peter said, (Acts i, 21,) "Therefore, of these men, who accompanied us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from John's immersion unto the day when he was taken up from us, must one be made a witness with us of his resurrection." A *substitute* as a witness is admissible; but a *successor* as a witness is absurd. No man could be a substitute who had not been personally acquainted with him from the time of his immersion by John, until he was taken up into heaven. Any person who was born after these events could not be even a substitute, much less a successor.

We are not, however, to look for any particular *form* of worship. There is none laid down in the New Testament. Singing and prayer, praising and thanksgiving, and adoration, are all acts of worship when designed as such. The particular *order* in which these acts shall be performed is not prescribed in the Scriptures. Certain things are to be taught, but as to the particular manner or mode of teaching, that is left to the judgment of the teacher. Ritualism is no part of the Christian religion.

If any man is to be considered as a successor of the Apostles, it is that man who teaches what they taught, and practices what they enjoined.

LITERARY NOTICES.

HOME LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*Chips from a German Workshop.* By MAX MÜLLER, M. A., Fellow of All-Soul's College, Oxford. In 2 vols. Containing Essays on the Science of Religion, Mythology, Traditions, and Customs. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 372-407. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

It is simply certain that these volumes will stimulate earnest inquiry upon the subjects of which they treat. Their author is a laborious and enthusiastic student of the languages, and it was natural enough for him, while tracing language back to its origin, to find himself constantly in direct contact with the progress of the religions of the world. For several years Mr. Müller has been engaged in the publication of the "Vedas; or, the Sacred Books of the Brahmans," four volumes of which have already appeared, and the remaining volumes are now passing through the press. It was in reference to this great work that Baron Bunsen suggested to Müller the title of the present volumes. Bunsen spent many days in explaining to the East India Company the importance of publishing Müller's edition of the text and Commentary on the sacred hymns of the Brahmans, and was, at last, successful; and while announcing to Müller the result of his labors, he said to him: "Now you have got a work for life—a large block that will take years to plane and polish; but, mind, let us have, from time to time, some chips from your workshop." The volumes before us are the first installments in answer to Bunsen's request.

These "Chips" from Müller's workshop will, doubtless, slap in the face many religious prejudices of the present day; and, while they will sometimes wound the principles of true religion, it is, nevertheless, quite certain that they will do a work that needs to be done. Religious dogmatism can no longer frown down the free investigation of every question that belongs to the history of man.

Mr. Müller was educated in Germany, but has learned to write in England. In his habits of thought he has the honest freedom of a true German, while his English training has enabled him to express himself in a very perspicuous style; a style, however, characterized by a rigid self-denial of

embellishments. These facts will commend his works to American readers, but will not save him from severe handling by many who will question their tendency.

We will now endeavor to give to our readers what Mr. Müller understands by the Science of Religion. He says: .

"During the last fifty years the accumulation of new and authentic materials for the study of the religions of the world has been most extraordinary; but such are the difficulties in mastering these materials, that I doubt whether the time has yet come for attempting to trace, after the model of the Science of Language, the definite outlines of the Science of Religion. By a succession of the most fortunate circumstances the canonical books of three of the principal religions of the ancient world have lately been recovered—the Veda, the Zend-Avesta, and the Tripitaka. But not only have we thus gained access to the most authentic documents from which to study the ancient religion of the Brahmans, the Zoroastrians, and the Buddhists, but, by discovering the real origin of Greek, Roman, and, likewise, of Teutonic, Slavonic, and Celtic mythology, it has become possible to separate the truly religious elements in the sacred traditions of these nations from the mythological crust by which they are surrounded, and thus to gain a clearer insight into the real faith of the ancient Aryan world."

It will be seen, from this extract, that he approaches the subject modestly, and with many misgivings as to the possibility of reaching, at present, just and satisfactory conclusions. He is, however, a brave and earnest thinker, and is not to be driven from the field of inquiry because there are difficulties to encounter. He frankly states these difficulties, and then as frankly states some of the advantages which a comparative study of religions will bring to the world. These advantages are declared to be, in substance, as follows:

1. If there is any agreement between the doctrines of the old religions and our own, it will benefit us to know it; if not, then to compare them, and learn how they differ, will help not a little toward confirming that which is the better of the two.

2. "The Science of Religion will, for the first time, assign to Christianity its right place among the religions of the world; it will show, for the first time, fully what was meant by 'the fullness of time'; it will restore to the whole history of the world, in its unconscious progress toward Christianity, its true and sacred character."

3. It will be of the greatest assistance to missionaries. "Missionaries are apt to look upon all other religions as something totally distinct from their own, as formerly they used to describe the languages of barbarous nations as something more like the twittering of birds than the articulate speech of men. The Science of Language has taught us that there is order and wisdom in all languages, and even the most degraded jargons contain the ruins of former greatness and beauty. The Science of Religion, I hope, will produce a similar change in our views of barbarous forms of faith and worship, and missionaries, instead of looking only for points of difference, will look out more anxiously for any common ground, any spark of the true

light that may still be revived, any altar that may be dedicated afresh to the true God."

4. "And, even to us at home, a wider view of the religious life of the world may teach many a useful lesson."

These and subsidiary matters are discussed in a manner peculiar to the distinguished author. It is the basis of Müller's creed that "what they [men] contemptuously call 'natural religion' is, in reality, the greatest gift that God has bestowed on the children of man; and without it revealed religion itself would have no firm foundation, no living roots in the heart of man." He holds that

"Every religion, even the most imperfect and degraded, has something that ought to be sacred to us, for there is in all religions a secret yearning after the true, though unknown God. Whether we see the Papua squatting in dumb meditation before his fetich, or whether we listen to Firdusi exclaiming: 'The height and the depth of the whole world have their center in Thee, O my God! I do not know thee what thou art; but I know that thou art what thou alone canst be;' we ought to feel that the place whereon we stand is holy ground."

Mr. Müller shows an intimate acquaintance with the various themes he has selected for discussion, and it may be safely affirmed that his chapter on "Comparative Mythology" is the ablest treatise upon that subject in any language. But the first volume, which discusses the Science of Religion, is of far greater interest than the second, which treats of Mythology, Traditions, and Customs. The great work upon which Mr. Müller has been engaged for so long a time, namely: the publication of the Veda, has brought his mind into contact with a religious history heretofore unknown to the Christian world. Under many embarrassing circumstances, he has pressed forward with his work until the last volumes have been placed in the hands of the printer. Surely, for such a contribution to the religious literature of our times, the author should receive the earnest thanks of all scholars. We hope, in some subsequent number of the *QUARTERLY*, to give a more detailed account of his labors, as well as a juster and fuller notice of his "Chips from a German Workshop." For the present we conclude with the following extract from the Preface of the volumes before us. What is here stated is worthy of the most profound consideration:

"If there is one thing which a comparative study of religions places in the clearest light, it is the inevitable decay to which every religion is exposed. It may seem almost like a truism that no religion can continue to be what it was during the lifetime of its founder and its first apostles. Yet it is but seldom borne in mind that without constant reformation, i. e., without a constant return to its fountain-head, every religion, even the most perfect, nay, the most perfect on account of its very perfection, more even than others, suffers from its contact with the world, as the purest air suffers from the mere fact of its being breathed.

"Whenever we can trace back a religion to its first beginnings, we find it free from many of the blemishes that offend us in its later phases. The founders of the ancient religions of

the world, as far as we can judge, were men of a high stamp, full of noble aspirations, yearning for truth, devoted to the welfare of their neighbors, examples of purity and unselfishness. What they desired to found upon earth was but seldom realized, and their sayings, if preserved in their original form, offer often a strange contrast to the practice of those who profess to be their disciples. As soon as a religion is established, and more particularly when it has become the religion of a powerful state, the foreign and worldly elements encroach more and more on the original foundation, and human interests mar the simplicity and purity of the plan which the founder had conceived in his own heart, and matured in his communings with his God. Even those who lived with Buddha misunderstood his words, and, at the Great Council which had to settle the Buddhist canon, Asoka, the Indian Constantine, had to remind the assembled priests that 'what had been said by Buddha, that alone was well said,' and that certain works ascribed to Buddha, as, for instance, the instruction given to his son, Râhula, were apocryphal, if not heretical. With every century, Buddhism, when it was accepted by nations differing as widely as Mongols and Hindus, when its sacred writings were translated into languages as wide apart as Sanskrit and Chinese, assumed widely different aspects, till, at last, the Buddhism of the Shamans, in the steppes of Tartary, is as different from the teaching of the original Samana, as the Christianity of the leader of the Chinese rebels is from the teaching of Christ. If missionaries could show to the Brahmins, the Buddhists, the Zoroastrians, nay, even to the Mohammedans how much their present faith differs from the faith of their forefathers and founders, if they could place in their hands and read with them, in a kindly spirit, the original documents on which these various religions profess to be founded, and enable them to distinguish between the doctrines of their own sacred books and the additions of later ages, an important advantage would be gained, and the choice between Christ and other masters would be rendered far more easy to many a truth-seeking soul. But for that purpose it is necessary that we, too, should see the beam in our own eyes, and learn to distinguish between the Christianity of the nineteenth century and the religion of Christ. If we find that the Christianity of the nineteenth century does not win as many hearts in India and China as it ought, let us remember that it was the Christianity of the first century, in all its dogmatic simplicity, but with its overpowering love of God and man, that conquered the world, and superseded religions and philosophies more difficult to conquer than the religious and philosophical systems of Hindus and Buddhists. If we can teach something to the Brahmins in reading with them their sacred hymns, they, too, can teach us something when reading with us the Gospel of Christ. Never shall I forget the deep despondency of a Hindu convert, a real martyr to his faith, who had pictured to himself, from the pages of the New Testament, what a Christian country must be, and who, when he came to Europe, found every thing so different from what he had imagined in his lonely meditations at Benares! It was the Bible only that saved him from returning to his old religion, and helped him to discern, beneath theological futilities accumulated during nearly two thousand years, beneath pharisaical hypocrisy, infidelity, and want of charity, the buried but still living seed committed to the earth by Christ and his Apostles. How can a missionary, in such circumstances, meet the surprise and questions of his pupils unless he may point to that seed and tell them what Christianity was meant to be; unless he may show that, like all other religions, Christianity, too, has had its history; that the Christianity of the nineteenth century is not the Christianity of the Middle Ages; that the Christianity of the Middle Ages was not that of the early councils; that the Christianity of the early councils was not that of the Apostles, and 'that what has been said by Christ, that alone was well said?'

"The advantages, however, which missionaries and other defenders of the faith will gain from a comparative study of religions, though important hereafter, are not, at present, the chief object of these researches. In order to maintain their scientific character they must be independent of all extraneous considerations; they must aim at truth, trusting that even unpalatable truths, like unpalatable medicine, will reinvigorate the system into which they enter. To those, no doubt, who value the tenets of their religion as the miser values his pearls and precious stones; thinking their value lessened if pearls and stones of the same

kind are found in other parts of the world, the Science of Religion will bring many a rude shock; but to the true believer truth, wherever it appears, is welcome, nor will any doctrine seem the less true or the less precious because it was seen, not only by Moses or Christ, but, likewise, by Buddha or Lao-tse. Nor should it be forgotten that while a comparison of ancient religions will certainly show that some of the most vital articles of faith are the common property of the whole of mankind, at least of all who seek the Lord, if, haply, they might feel after him, and find him, the same comparison alone can possibly teach us what is peculiar to Christianity, and what has secured to it that pre-eminent position which now it holds in spite of all obloquy. The gain will be greater than the loss, if loss there be, which I, at least, shall never admit."

2.—*Poems, by LUCY LARCOM.* Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 16mo. pp. 275. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

It has been said that the mechanical spirit of the age, especially in our New World, is quite inimical to poetry, and that, in seeking to utilize every element of power, whether mental or physical, we encourage the practical to the exclusion of the ideal. To some extent this is true. But whatever society may do in furtherance of its own material plans of improvement or progress, the individual is certainly left free to follow the promptings of his own peculiar genius, and if a poet by nature (*poeta nascitur non fit*) he can, at pleasure, choose the flowery paths of ideal beauty, or soar aloft amid "cloud-capped realms of thought and fancy" in fond pursuit of his favorite muse, peopling his celestial paradise with beings of diviner mold than common clay.

The special aim of modern poets seems directed to the external embodiment of sentiment and feeling as expressed in smooth and faultless versification, melodious rhythm, flowing, easy, and graceful periods, musical as murmuring waters, and soothing as a lullaby. Instead of exalting our weary, world-worn spirits to the sublime heights of ideal contemplation, we feel limited to the actual and commonplace around us, our richest treasures of thought and feeling undeveloped, our longings for the infinite unsatisfied, and our emotional nature untouched, save by shallow appeals to our sympathy in sickly repetitions of worn-out phrases, personal complainings of life, that to some has proved a failure, all too faintly expressive of those higher and nobler impulses and aspirations which characterize every true and earnest heart. A poet should be the soul's interpreter, kindling anew its enthusiasm, and inspiring it to lofty endeavor. Not content with portraying material objects alone, or bringing before us, in panoramic beauty and grandeur, the glories of sea, earth, and sky, he should seek to fathom the more subtle domain of spiritual life, so fraught with deep and mysterious experiences, and, by a ready sympathy with every varied feeling of the human heart, endeavor to breathe words of solace and cheer to the despairing soul, quicken its half-formed purposes for good, awaken into new life its

dormant energies, and irradiate its gloom with visions of the coming dawn. We do not think our New World deficient in those elements which constitute genuine poetry, although its ceaseless activities and constant changes may, at times, prove somewhat detrimental to that seclusion and study so necessary to the poet.

It is unfortunate for American literature, as well as for the fame of our authors, that so many writers "rush into print" almost before their ink is dry. Especially is it to be regretted that young persons, devoid of experience or mental culture, with only sufficient knowledge as will enable them to distinguish between lyric, dramatic, pastoral, or heroic verse, should force their crude thoughts (too often plagiarisms, better expressed in their original prose) upon a generous public, whose anxiety to encourage literary merit often does positive injury to the future fame of a young author thus suddenly brought into notice. If we should point these youthful aspirants to a past age, and quote the saying of an eminent English writer, that "No poem should be published in less than thirty years after its first composition," thus giving its author ample time to perfect it in all its parts, as a sculptor would finish the *chef-d'œuvre* that was to immortalize his name, they would tell us that *American* genius, fostered under new institutions, was of more rapid growth, requiring no such delay in order to mature its work. How unfortunate for ancient authors that they did not live in our day, thus avoiding the tedium of laborious study and research! What would modern writers think of such literary toil as was endured by Virgil, Pliny, Aristotle, Seneca, Fenelon, Rousseau, and Buffon? It is said of the former, that he was so dissatisfied with the "*Æneid*" that he ordered it to be burned, and that out of every thirty verses which he wrote in the morning scarcely ten were left at night. Fenelon corrected "*Telemachus*" seven times before allowing it to be published; and Rousseau copied several of his works five times, some of his sentences costing him four or five nights' study. Pliny the elder read over two thousand volumes before completing his "*Natural History*," and Buffon studied his great work entitled "*Epoques de la Nature*" for fifty years, copying it eighteen times before giving it to the public. He would sometimes rewrite a sentence twenty times, and was once fourteen hours in finding the proper word for turning a period. Our modern economists will say all this was a great waste of time and talent. Perhaps so; but these illustrious names will go down to posterity, and be remembered by generations yet unborn, while the fame of our more ambitious writers of to-day will scarcely survive the present century.

Having said this much in regard to authors in general, we now come to the examination of the poetical volume whose title is at the head of this notice. We wish we could say that the work before us formed an exception to others of its class; but here, as elsewhere, we discover the absence of

originality of thought or depth of feeling, while hasty and imperfect sketches of life, character, scenery, etc., fill up the volume from beginning to end, with only here and there a thought or fanciful conception that could in any way be mistaken for an inspiration. We read several of these effusions before they were collected into a volume, and admired their naturalness, simplicity of expression, and harmonious rhythm; but, like most of our newspaper poetry, they scarcely bear a re-reading, especially in book form, where their monotony is the more apparent, like so many beads of similar size and shape strung along upon the same silken cord with but little variation or design.

3.—*By-Ways of Europe.* By BAYARD TAYLOR. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. 12mo. pp. 470. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

WHILE the question of international copyright is up for discussion, we respectfully suggest that there are other things that need regulation by wholesome laws. And, when the copyright question is settled, it may be as well to settle these other things at the same time. Surely, there should be a stringent law passed against the publication of stupid books of travel; for there is no literature so utterly worthless as this kind. And yet the country is flooded with books of travel whose only recommendation is the fidelity with which they follow the descriptions of places that have already been described a thousand and one times.

Every "Rev. Mr. Sourball" who is fortunate enough to get sick, and, as a consequence, is fortunate enough to obtain leave of absence from his congregation for a few months' European tour; or, every dry goods clerk or "sentimental idler" who has money enough to spend a few months abroad, must cross the ocean, rush over the highways of travel, and then as rapidly rush into print, to give us the inevitable reproduction of the guide-books in endless platitudes and unbearable stupidities.

But Bayard Taylor does not belong to this class of travelers, and his books, as a general rule, do not belong to the dull class. During the past twenty-two years he has written and published ten volumes of travel, all of which have been eagerly sought by the reading public, and many of which are yet in demand; and it would have been well for Mr. Taylor had he stopped with those volumes, for we do not think that "*By-Ways of Europe*" will add any thing to his reputation. Not that the book is devoid of interest, but because it cultivates a field which, though for the most part out of the ordinary course of travel, has little or no interest in it for the general reader. And then the style is scarcely up to Mr. Taylor's usual vein. He seems to have very little interest himself in the places described; hence, the book has the appearance of having been made up of the odds and ends of what has been left out in other volumes—a sort of *disjecta membra* of many

years of travel. But one thing, however, will commend this volume, as it does all of Mr. Taylor's works ; it is simply a record of facts and experiences, and is not burdened with crude philosophical reflections upon half-perceived, and still less understood, meaning of things. Mr. Taylor is always deliberate, speaks only what he knows, is cautious in his generalizations, and is remarkably candid in his conclusions. Hence, while the general reader will not be particularly attracted by his present volume, for the reasons already intimated, it is also true that a very large number of people will find in it the very things they want, and will welcome it as a valuable contribution to a class of literature that could no longer be kept respectable if such men as Mr. Taylor were to stop writing.

4.—*The New West ; or, California in 1867-68.* By CHARLES LORING BRACE.
New York : G. P. Putnam & Son. London : N. Trübner & Co. 12mo.
pp. 373. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

THIS is not only an interesting book, but a really valuable one. Just now, when, by means of the Pacific Railroad, California is brought so near to us, a work upon that country, from the hands of so competent an author as Mr. Brace, will be heartily welcomed by American readers. The style of the book is admirable, full of energy and lively interest, while the facts presented can not fail to be of service to those who may wish to become familiar with that great and growing country on our Pacific coast. Much of the matter is entirely new to most Americans, and can not fail to awaken a deep interest in that land which has heretofore been mainly *terra incognita* to a large majority of the people on this side of the Rocky Mountains. The following, concerning the city of San Francisco, furnishes our more Eastern cities with some facts for serious consideration :

"The more I examine the Californian Capital, the more I am struck with its aspect as a city where democracy has succeeded. Universal suffrage has had here its legitimate effects ; it has given the government of affairs to the intelligent and moral classes, and those with most material interests. This may have arisen from the influence of large numbers of educated and energetic young Americans who early emigrated here, or it may be an effect of that tremendous outburst of moral power which overrode all the bounds of law and order, and put the elements of rascality and devilishness under foot for a generation to come—the revolution under the Vigilance Committee, thirteen years since. However it be explained, it is certain that the city is much better governed than any of our eastern cities. The police is good ; the citizen is safe in the lowest streets ; fires are less frequent and destructive than with us, though the houses are of the most combustible nature ; there is little open and repulsive vice ; gambling is held in with a tight rein ; the streets are dirty, it is true, but cleaner than those of New York ; the schools (of which I shall speak more hereafter) and the school system, are the best ; the Sunday is better observed than in New York. It is evident that the intelligent and moral element has the control, and keeps it vigorously. And all these results, be it remembered, have been obtained, not from the State, as with us, but by universal suffrage in the city. Of course, there is jobbery here, as elsewhere, and the low and immoral elements get a voice sometimes, but, on the whole, the city seems well governed."

- 5.—*Tablets.* By A. BRONSON ALCOTT. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 12mo. pp. 208. 1868. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

As its name indicates, this volume is a transcript of thoughts upon various topics, written during hours of calm reflection, instead of a complete treatise upon any one subject. Mr. Alcott has been long and favorably known as a philosopher, his early life having been devoted to the cause of education, especially of youth, while his later years have been given to study and philosophical research. He has been styled the "Peripatetic Philosopher," owing to his "Conversations," both public and private, in cities and villages where he has been invited to discourse, upon "Divinity," "Human Nature," "Ethics," and "Dietetics," including, also, a wide range of practical questions. He is a scholar of no ordinary attainments, possessing an original mind, with fine perception of the great principles of life in their relation to morals. Under the head of "Practical," Mr. Alcott gives us brief essays upon "The Garden," "Recreation," "Friendship," "Culture," "Counsels," and "Books;" while in the second division of his work, entitled "Speculative," he discourses upon "Instrumentalities," "Mind," "Genesis," and "Metamorphoses." In this department of his work his style is often transcendental, differing materially from that of modern essayists, and resembling more the writings of Plato, Seneca, Montaigne, and Coleridge. Like Emerson, he is almost too much of an idealist to be popular with the masses; and to the casual reader, full of sympathy and enthusiasm, his present work will seem dull and prosaic. His method of treating a subject is purely didactic, instead of rhetorical, and though he makes no display of learning or logic, he shows himself a perfect master of the English language, using it as the vehicle of thought rather than of ornament. Mr. Alcott was born at the close of the last century, in Wolcott, Conn., and being the son of a farmer, and unable to obtain an education, at that time, suited to his intellectual tastes, he early applied himself to study, depending on his own resources, and may be considered, like many other eminent New England scholars and authors, a "self-made man." He has published but two works, and those, with the exception of his last, appeared many years ago, one of them being entitled "Record of a School," the other, "Conversations on the Gospels." Most of the philosophic works that have emanated from New England during the past twenty-five years have been revised by him, and he is also the author of numerous magazine articles. His devotion to the cause of education, and his peculiar method of instruction, attracted the attention of celebrated educators across the Atlantic, and in 1842 he was invited to visit England, where he was cordially received by his friends, who had already given his name to their school at "Alcott House," near London. He remained abroad several months, and, on his return, removed to Boston.

- 6.—*Reminiscences of Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy. A Social and Artistic Biography.* By ELISE POLKO. Translated from the German by Lady Wallace, with Additional Letters addressed to English Correspondents. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 16mo. pp. 334. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

IN this volume we are first introduced to the great musician when he is fifteen years of age. We catch a glimpse of him as he appeared at that time to "Old Zelter," who wrote to Goëthe concerning the youthful prodigy. From that time we are gracefully carried along with the development of Mendelssohn into mature manhood. During this period we are often in company with such masters as Moscheles, Hummel, Berger, Klein, Paganini, etc., while the home of Mendelssohn is frequently visited by such notables as Humboldt and Goëthe. At last, when his success is fully assured, we willingly join the rapturous applause which greeted him at London, Paris, Düsseldorf, Leipsic, Frankfort-on-the-Main, and Berlin. At all these places he won immortal fame. We are told that the "enthusiasm is indescribable with which 'St. Paul,' even before it was completed, was received and studied in its separate parts, by the Düsseldorf circles. When Mendelssohn caused any of the choruses to be rehearsed, listeners assembled in crowds, and often burst forth into loud shouts of applause."

Madame Polko's reminiscences of Mendelssohn will be hailed with pleasure in this country, where the works of the great composer are so highly appreciated. The Madame evidently writes with a warm interest in her subject, and may sometimes seem to be rather too partial in her delineations; nevertheless, we are truly thankful for her not only interesting, but highly valuable, work. The book contains, in an appendix, several unpublished letters of Mendelssohn, which will be an invaluable treasure to those who are already acquainted with his charming style.

Few men have ever lived who had all the qualities of head and heart necessary to a truly cultivated gentleman more fully developed, and more beautifully blended in their proper proportions, than had the author of "Elijah." His compositions form a class in themselves. In delicate sweetness, in refined and graceful movement, he is scarcely ever equaled, and never surpassed; while the surprises of enthusiasm which are every now and then breaking in upon his quiet thoughts make up a marked feature of his works, and give a charming variety to all his compositions. The following remark of Hildebrandt gives us the key to his whole character: "We often marveled at all the wisdom in this young head. We constantly felt how immeasurably he was above us, and yet, at other times, he was as full of boyish mirth and high spirits as the youngest among us." His influence upon his friends was of the most positive character, hence we do not wonder at the enthusiasm which marks Madame Polko's "Reminiscences."

- 7.—*Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, on the Book of Psalms*, by ALBERT BARNES. In Three Volumes. Vols. ii, iii. New York: Harper & Brothers. 16mo. pp. 383-343. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

A HURRIED glance, as it must needs be, for the present, through these volumes is enough to show that the author fully sustains the reputation for candid investigation, wide and wise scholarship, Christian charity, and pious devotion, which he so distinctly won in his former labors, and which have been so justly and thoroughly awarded him by the grateful Christian world.

Pausing, here and there, in this hurried glance to rest upon some well-known and sweet Psalm, we have been refreshed by the music of it as rendered by this skillful and absorbed interpreter of the hidden beauty and grace of the strain. We had noted a few of these Psalms for reference in this notice; but to mention them would be an almost irresistible temptation to make extracts from the notes and comments, which would lengthen our notice beyond reasonable bounds. The thousands who will read these volumes, in the study, and in the family, and in the Sunday School, will have the whole mine of devotional and explanatory wealth to explore at their leisure. While we thus speak, candor compels us to say, also, that we do not think that Mr. Barnes's type of mind and habits of thought so well adapted to interpreting the poetry of the Bible as its prose. Hence, we do not think these volumes equal to most of his other works.

With these volumes Albert Barnes closes his labors of Commentary upon the Christian Scriptures. For forty years has his toil in this special field been prosecuted, and the Christian world has cordially welcomed and honored his work. In the ripeness of his years, and amid the rich harvestings of his sowing, he now awaits the messenger-angel whose hand shall lead him and whose wing shall bear him to that unspeakable reward of ever-growing blessing, which is the final and eternal inheritance of all the faithful laborers of God. And if every servant of Christ and of the Church, reaching the years of Albert Barnes, could look back upon a life so constantly and so well spent as his, how joyous would be the hour of departure from the field, and what treasures of blessings would be left behind for the generations to come after!

In closing his work, Mr. Barnes says:

"Here I close my exposition of this book, and with it all that I purpose or expect to prepare in attempting to furnish a Commentary on the Holy Scriptures. The volumes which I have prepared have occupied me daily, almost without intermission, for nearly forty years of my life; and now, at sixty-eight years of age, and with the diminished power of vision with which it has pleased God to afflict me, I can hope to attempt no more. More than a generation has passed away while I have been engaged in these labors; and the finishing of this work, and the reason why I can not hope to do more, admonish me that I am soon to follow that generation to the grave, and that all my work must soon be ended. . . . I can not close this work without emotion. I can not lay down my pen at the end of this long task without the feeling that with me the work of life is nearly over. Yet, I could close

it at no better place than in finishing the exposition of this book; and the language with which the Book of Psalms itself closes, seems to me to be eminently appropriate to all that I have experienced. All that is past—all in the prospect of what is to come—call for a long, a joyful, a triumphant HALLELUJAH!"

-
- 8.—*The Life and Epistles of St. Paul.* By the REV. W. J. CONYBEARE, M. A., *Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge,* and the REV. J. S. HOWSON, M. A., *Principal of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool.* Two vols. in one. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 8vo. pp. 1015. 1869. For sale by R. W. Carroll & Co.

PERHAPS no contribution to religious literature, in modern times, has been received with more general favor than this work. It has now been nearly twenty years since it was first issued from the London press, and the demand for it is as great now as at any time since its first appearance. Such permanent popularity must have a solid basis on which to rest, and such, we are convinced, is the fact.

The plan of the work is happily conceived, and its execution is above all praise. No other work has ever given to us such a vivid picture of the great Apostle to the Gentiles. The vast amount of information concerning the coasts, islands, etc., of the Eastern Mediterranean, collected from time to time by detachments of the English navy, has been laid under contribution, and happily used in throwing every possible light upon the life and Epistles of St. Paul. Every available matter, whether gleaned from travel, surveys, or official reports, has been made to bear a part in introducing us more intimately to the Apostle's life and labors. Hence, the volume soon enables us to become acquainted with the *man* Paul. We are made traveling companions with him in his missionary journeys; we have a place among his hearers when he preaches to the people; and, in fact, share with him all his joys and sorrows throughout his trying, though splendid, ministry. In short, the work is just what was needed to give us a proper view of one of the most splendid characters the world has ever seen; and, as such, it should have a place in every well-selected religious library.

-
- 9.—*The Land and its Story; or, the Sacred Historical Geography of Palestine.* By N. C. BURT, D. D., author of "The Far East," "Hours among the Gospels," etc. Illustrated. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 4to. pp. 381. 1869.

A GOOD and reliable historical geography of Palestine has been much needed. Most of the works on that subject are either somewhat out of date, or else very incomplete and unsatisfactory. And yet, no country in the world, in its geography and history, is of such great interest as the sacred

land of Palestine. Dr. Burt, in the volume before us, has made a valuable contribution to the geographical and historical literature of that country. The plan of his work is simple. After four lectures, of a general and preparatory character, in company with the reader, he makes the tour of Palestine, "going from south to north; stopping upon each important geographical locality; observing what is of present interest, and gathering up, and exhibiting, in the light of the actual scene, its Scripture associations. In thus traversing the land from south to north the development of the geography coincides with the general flow of the history; the south country coming into prominence early in the Old Testament narrative, the central country rising into chief importance later in that narrative, while the northern country, or Galilee, finds its great and lasting significance in New Testament times, in connection with Gospel history."

The work shows considerable painstaking, a very correct understanding of the subject, and is every-where marked with a spirit of frankness and reverence for the Christian religion, which can not fail to commend it to Christian readers. The style is simple, but quite perspicuous, and, though too tame to interest the general reader, is well enough adapted to the plan of the work.

10.—*Night Scenes in the Bible.* By REV. DANIEL MARCH, D. D., author of "Walks and Homes of Jesus." Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis: Zeigler, M'Curdy & Co. 8vo. pp. 544. 1868.

THIS volume belongs to a class of works that are generally failures. Any effort to intensify the interest in Bible scenes, by treating them in human language, must be made at great hazard. The Bible is a perfect book, not only in the fullness and character of its teachings, but also in the style in which it is written. It contains the finest poetry, and the finest specimens of prose composition, that can be found in any language; hence, it is a most difficult thing to improve on what is found in that blessed book. We make new classifications, (for many of those in the Bible are arbitrary,) but there is little else we can undertake with safety.

With this view deeply impressed upon our mind, it was with many doubts that we opened Dr. March's volume. It had an inviting look from the outside, but we could not hope for corresponding matter within. But we are now prepared to say we were agreeably disappointed. Instead of the platitudes and overstrained metaphors which usually characterize works of this class, it abounds in rich practical observations, natural and graceful descriptions, chaste and elegant diction, while, here and there, throughout the entire work, are found some of the most eloquent passages in the English language.

- 11.—*Debate on Baptism and Kindred Subjects, between ELDER JAMES M. MATHES, of the Church of Christ, and REV. T. S. BROOKS, of the M. E. Church. Held in the Town Hall in Bedford, Ind., continuing six days, from January 28, 1868, to February 3, inclusive. By ELDER JAMES M. MATHES. Cincinnati: H. S. Bosworth. 12mo. pp. 321. 1868.*

THIS debate is between a courteous Christian gentleman and a coarse, dogmatic sectarian. It discusses the difference between New Testament Christianity and the religion of human creeds. Those who are curious to understand this difference, both in letter and spirit, will find much of what they want in this book.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 12.—*Galilée, les droits de la science et la méthode des sciences physiques par TH. HENRI MARTN.* (Galileo: The Rights of Science and the Method of the Physical Sciences, by TH. HENRI MARTIN.) Paris: 1868. 8vo. pp. viii, 428.
- Galilée, son procès, sa condamnation d'après des documents inédits par HENRI DE L'EPINOIS.* (Galileo; his Trial and Condemnation, according to Inedited Documents, by HENRI DE L'EPINOIS.) Paris: 1867. 8vo. pp. 108.
- Galilée, sa vie, des découvertes et ses travaux par le DR. MAX. PARCHAPPE.* (Galileo; his Life, Discoveries, and Labors, by DR. MAX. PARCHAPPE.) Paris: 1866. 8vo. pp. xv, 401.

THE publication of the first of the above-named works leads us to mention the others in connection therewith. Every one familiar with the life and fortunes of the scientific reformer, Galileo, knows what importance attaches to his trial and condemnation. The question whether or not the venerable philosopher was, on the night of the 21st of June, 1633, put upon the rack, by the fathers of the Holy Inquisition, has, for more than two centuries, been the subject of acrimonious debate. Roman Catholic writers have generally stoutly denied the charge which has been continually preferred by most others. There seemed to be no way of deciding the matter to the final satisfaction of unprejudiced minds. It was strongly suspected that the official reports and documents concerning the trial had been mutilated, and the fact that they were not allowed to be published did not tend to lessen this suspicion. The straightforward way (a way, however, to which "our Catholic brethren" are seldom inclined) would have been to issue an official and complete edition of the documents, and to open the original to the inspection of scholars. This would have given the literary world the means of settling

the question, so far as it can be settled by mere diplomatic investigation. To be sure, persons whose discretion could be trusted had, now and then, been allowed a peep at these documents, but M. de l'Epinois was the first at whose disposal they were placed, and, we suppose, that even he must have been in some manner restricted, for he did not venture to publish them complete. He has, nevertheless, in describing the manuscript, and in the fragments which he publishes, furnished a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject. Both he and M. Martin think they have proved conclusively that Galileo was not put to the torture; but whoever reads the chapter which M. Parchappe devotes to this question (pp. 245-260) will, probably, still be unconvinced. The concluding sentence of this chapter will stand in the face of all special pleading from the partisans of the Roman Church: "*La doute de l'histoire est le châtement mérité du secret de la procédure inquisitoriale obstinément gardé jusqu'à nos jours.*"

For the rest we can heartily recommend all these works to persons interested in the investigation of the relation of the Roman Church to progress in Science and letters. The work of Parchappe is particularly valuable as containing, in an appendix covering 119 pages, a complete digest and analysis, with translations, of the principal passages of Galileo's greatest work, the "Dialogue on the two great Systems of the Universe, the Ptolemaic and the Copernican"—the work which mortally offended Urban VIII and the Church of Rome. M. Martin's book is another elaborate attempt to show that this Church is favorable to the progress of Science. He condemns the condemnation of Galileo in unsparing language, but is, of course, (from his point of view,) bound to prove that this is not, at the same time, a condemnation of the Church. The translation of a few passages will give a clear idea of his style of argument:

"None of the decisions of the Roman Congregations against the new astronomical system were otherwise published than in the name of the Congregations themselves. Now, although, even according to Roman principles these Congregations may demand obedience, and impose punishments, they can not make an article of faith of a proposition which has not previously been uttered as such by an infallible authority; nor can they make it a duty to regard a proposition as heretical which has not previously been condemned as heretical by the Church, or by the Pope speaking in the name of the Church (*ex Cathedra*); therefore Galileo had no need, either before or after his condemnation, nor had any Catholic, either before or after him, any need to feel himself bound to believe in the immobility of the earth, and in the motion of the sun around the earth." (p. 144.) "The Popes Paul V and Urban VIII had scruples in regard to the system of Copernicus and Galileo; they were also personally inclined to regard it as incompatible with the Bible; they caused the Roman Congregations to condemn the system, the

books in which it was defended, and one of its representatives, but they did not mean, *as Popes*, to declare *in the name of the Church* the new system to be heretical and contrary to Scripture; they did not mean to declare this, because they were not firmly convinced of it, or, better, because divine Providence did not permit it. They left the responsibility with the Congregations for their fallible decisions, which had, of course, to be reversed after the proof of the truth of the condemned system had become incontrovertible. *As men*, Paul V and Urban VIII erred with the Roman Congregations, whose decisions they both knew and desired beforehand; but they had no thought of confirming these decisions, and still less of announcing the propositions therein contained to be articles of faith. In one word, in spite of the human weaknesses of these two Popes, the Papacy had remained infallible in the exercise of its dogmatic authority. (!) . . . Thus in testing the decisions of the Roman Congregations of 1616 and 1633, one does not raise a complaint against *the Church*; there is, therefore, no occasion to defend the Church; and those imprudent persons must be disavowed who compromise the name of the Church by setting up a questionable defense of decrees which did not go out from her, and have since been revoked. We are called upon calmly to judge only the resolutions passed by fallible men, and that under difficult circumstances, which admit of our judging mildly of their motives without justifying their conclusions." (pp. 151, 152.)

This style of reasoning is not new, and needs no further comment. The motto which the author prefixes to his book is: "*Toute la vérité, rien que la vérité*," the whole truth, nothing but the truth; which forcibly reminds us of the saying: "*La vérité ne fait pas autant de bien dans le monde, que ses apparences y font de mal*;" the truth does not produce as much good in the world as the appearances of it do harm.

-
- 13.—*Johannes Kepler. Vier Bücher in drei Theilen. Von DR. EDMUND REITLINGER, k. k. Professor am Polytechnikum in Wien, unter Mitwirkung von C. W. NEUMANN, und dem Herausgeber, C. GRUNER. Mit vielen Illustrationen. Erster Theil.* (Johannes Kepler. Four Books in Three Parts. By DR. EDMUND REITLINGER, Royal Professor at the Polytechnical School in Vienna, in co-operation with C. W. NEUMANN and the Editor, C. GRUNER. With many Illustrations. Part First.) Stuttgart: 1868. 8vo. pp. xvi, 224.
- Nikolaus Kopernikus und Martin Luther. Nach ermländischen Archivalien, von DR. FRANZ HIPLER, Subregens des Klerikalseminars zu Braunsberg.* (Nicholas Copernicus and Martin Luther. From Sources contained in the Archives of Ermeland, by DR. FRANZ HIPLER, Subregent of the Clerical Seminary at Braunsberg.) Braunsberg: 1868. 8vo. pp. 75.

COPERNICUS, Luther, Kepler—three names of which Germany has good reason to be proud; for that Copernicus was also of German descent, and

not of Polish, as was commonly supposed, is now probably beyond question. The little work of Dr. Hipler is scarcely what its title would lead one to expect—a comparison of Copernicus and Luther. It is true, he gives us in the introduction, in a few pregnant sentences, a comparison of the character and the reformatory work of these remarkable men. Then, as a *pendant* to his picture of Copernicus, which constitutes the main part of the work, he prints, for the first time, a *judicium de Lutero*, written in 1523, by Johannes Dantiscus, Bishop of Ermeland, who, as ambassador of the King of Poland, had visited Luther in Wittenberg. But the publication of the two writings under one cover was, doubtless, dictated more by convenience than by any real relation which they bear to each other. The biographical sketch of Copernicus is, however, really valuable. Those who have hitherto, since Gassendi, written the life of the father of modern astronomy, have been mainly dependent upon him for the facts. The present author has gone back to the sources. The materials contained in the archives at Frauenburg, Königsberg, and Upsala were placed at his disposal, and through them he has shed new light upon many doubtful points in Copernicus's life. We are no longer in doubt upon any important point in the chronology thereof; and we now know much more about the course of his education, and about his position and activity in Frauenburg than we did before. All previously existing biographies of Copernicus will have to be corrected in accordance with the results of Dr. Hipler's researches, and all future ones be governed by them.

The modern theory of the universe, which takes its name from Copernicus, owes its existence quite as much to Kepler. The former made the grand discovery that the sun, and not the earth, is the center of our system, but it remained for the latter to discover the true orbit of the planets, and the laws of their motions. As Kepler was, without doubt, one of the greatest minds, so the tragic story of his life makes him one of the most interesting characters of all ages. His early career was brilliant, and outwardly successful; but misfortune overtook him; he was persecuted, his aged mother accused of witchcraft, and he ended his days in poverty, and without a home. The Thirty Years' War, which robbed him of his livelihood for a long period, also robbed him of his fame. Men carried on a bloody and cruel war for a whole generation about the way to heaven, and he who said, "In heaven we live, in heaven we are, we and all the bodies of the universe," was forgotten, especially in his native land. Germany was laid waste; half its population destroyed; and not only its material prosperity, but also its intellectual culture, was annihilated. Kepler's science emigrated, and found the friends in England and France it could not find at home. Even his manuscripts were destined, at a later period, to pass into the hands of a foreign monarch—Catherine II of Russia. But at length, after the

lapse of more than a century and a half, Kepler's astronomy found, contemporaneous with the new birth of German literature in the latter half of the eighteenth century, worthy apostles in the land of his birth, and, by and by, men began to remember, with honor, his long-neglected name. Kästner, Herder, Ostertag, and others lifted up their voices; and now, when Germany calls the roll of her heroes in Science and Literature, Kepler is never forgotten. Busts and statues of him are to be found in public places in various parts of Germany; (in Regensburg; in the Walhalla not far from that city; in Kremsmünster; in the polytechnicum at Karlsruhe, and the Nicolai-Church in Hamburg;) votive tablets have been erected to his memory in the several towns in which he lived; streets have been named after him in numerous important cities; a grand edition of his complete works is in process of publication; (seven volumes have already appeared;) and, as a lasting token of the veneration and gratitude of the whole German people, it is proposed to erect a colossal monument to him in his birthplace, Weilderstadt, in the kingdom of Würtemberg. A committee was organized for this purpose in 1860-61; since then the work has been steadily progressing, and it is expected that it will now soon be completed. It was in connection with this monument that the biography, the first installment of which is now before the public, was undertaken. In the midst of his labors as business manager of the Monument Committee, Ober-Justiz-Revisor Gruner conceived the idea of erecting a biographical monument to Kepler, which should be worthy to take its place beside the one in bronze. A biography that would be attractive to the layman, and yet satisfy the demands of Science; this was what Herr Gruner desired, and what he has aimed to produce. He had no desire to shine; he knew he could not do every thing himself, and so made it a point to interest competent persons to aid him in carrying out his thought. Like one about to erect a noble edifice, it was enough for him to make suggestions in drawing the plan, to furnish the necessary materials, and to find the men to build it in worthy style. He has been occupied ever since 1863 with the preliminary work necessary to such a biography; making the greatest exertions to discover every thing of interest relating to Kepler, which have resulted in the acquisition of valuable data of every description, hitherto supposed to have been lost forever. At an early stage of the work Herr Gruner succeeded in interesting the historian Capt. Neumann, who rendered valuable assistance in the search for facts. Prof. Dr. Reitlinger, of Vienna, was finally added to the number of co-laborers, and it is to him that we owe the written biography as it stands. The volume before us contains, besides the introduction and a mass of genealogical and other documents in the appendix, eight chapters, under the following heads: "Ancestry," "Birth and Childhood," "In the Monastery-School," "At the University," "Professor of Mathematics," "The Mystery of the Universe,"

"Kepler's First Marriage," "During the Persecution of the Protestants." Opposite the title-page is a magnificent steel engraving of Kepler. The head is grand, the face full of power; and it might be said of the Suabian astronomer, as once of Luther, *habet profundos oculos et mirabiles speculationes in capite suo*. We look with interest for the continuation of the work.

-
- 14.—*Pythagoras der Weise von Samos. Ein Lebensbild nach den neusten Forschungen bearbeitet von EDUARD BALTZER. Mit einer Uebersichts-Karte.* (Pythagoras, the Philosopher of Samos. A Life-Picture according to the Latest Investigations, by EDWARD BALTZER. With a Synoptical Map.) Nordhausen: 1868. 8vo. pp. viii, 180.

FROM Kepler and Copernicus to Pythagoras is but a step, although a long one. Every one acquainted with the history of Astronomy knows that there are passages in ancient writers which seem to point to "the philosopher of Samos" as the discoverer of the heliocentric system. Occasionally one meets with a person who, having heard of this and of the "confession" in the preface to the work "*De Revolutionibus*," that the author had found in ancient writers accounts of philosophers who had asserted the motion of the earth, is foolish enough to maintain that Copernicus did nothing but rehabilitate an ancient Pythagorean theory. Now, this would be exceedingly interesting if it were true; but, unfortunately, it is not. Pythagoras, whatever else he may have known, certainly knew nothing about the heliocentric theory of the universe. The whole story is founded on a blunder; the blunder of supposing that because Pythagoras taught the doctrine of a central fire, around which every thing revolved, this fire must be the sun. It is a pity that, according to Pythagoras, this fire is at the center of the earth, and the earth a hemisphere situated in the center of the universe. So that what Copernicus owed to Pythagoras directly is somewhat difficult to see. With Kepler it is somewhat different. Pythagoras's doctrine of the "harmony of the spheres" had, undoubtedly, great and direct influence on the mathematical speculations of Kepler. It should never be forgotten that Kepler was originally educated for the Church; that he went through the regular three years' training for the ministry in the theological school at Tübingen, and that he was not a little disappointed when he was tacitly excluded from that calling. But in many respects he remained a theologian his life-long. He was not content with the discovery of laws that explained a part of the Kosmos, he wanted to explain the whole, to comprehend the whole. The discovery of the true orbit of the planets, and of the plane-velocity of their motions, he regarded only as the bridge to the discovery of the mathematical harmony of the universe; a problem to the solution of which he devoted ten years of his life. He had drunk at the fountain of Pythagorean speculation, and, intoxicated,

he listened to the rapturous music of the singing stars. He, another Saul, sought what he did not find, and found what he did not seek—he found the Third Law, in which, also, the law of gravitation is contained as the blossom in the bud.

There is no history of the physical sciences, in the broad sense, which does not include the name of Pythagoras. But it is chiefly as a religious and social reformer that we find him pictured in the book, the title of which stands at the head of this notice. Much has been said, first and last, on this point, and very little of it well said. In fact, what is said about Pythagoras any way stands in the inverse ratio to what is known of him. His life is interwoven with such a mass of legend, and his doctrines so inextricably confused with those of his disciples in later times, that it is next to impossible to distinguish fact from fable in his biography, or genuine from spurious in his teachings. With Herr Eduard Baltzer, as with so many others who write books nowadays, the aim seems to be to borrow the splendor of antiquity for the purpose of making certain crudities of speculation or practice theoretically respectable. The special *marotte* which assumes the greatest prominence here is *vegetarianism*. Of the eight and forty chapters of the book *six* are on this subject! If the author had treated all the other doctrines attributed to Pythagoras with the same exhaustive (and exhausting) "thoroughness," there would have been no end to his book, but soon an end of his readers. As it is, the book has, after all, something attractive about it, so that we are inclined to think that if the writer could have contented himself with the objective point of view he might have produced a work on Pythagoras worth the printer's ink, and the trouble of reading. To be sure, he would have had to go to other and different sources for his information. He could not have undertaken, as he did, merely to reproduce, in popular form, the opinions of Röth, as developed in his "*Geschichte unsrer abendländischen Philosophie*;" opinions which, though supported by astonishing learning, have found little favor among competent critics.

-
- 15.—*Theologisch-homiletisches Bibelwerk*; herausgegeben von J. P. LANGE. *Des Alten Testamentes xii Theil. Die Sprüche Salomonis*; von DR. O. ZOECKLER. *xiii Theil, Das Hohelied und der Prediger Salomonis*, von DR. O. ZOECKLER. Bielefeld und Leipzig, 1868. (Theological and Homiletical Bible-work, edited by J. P. LANGE. Part XII of the Old Testament—The Proverbs of Solomon, by DR. O. ZOECKLER; also, Part XII, Ecclesiastes, by the same.) Large 8vo. pp. 220, 218.

DR. LANGE's great Biblical Commentary is already favorably known to the American public through the portions of it, on the New Testament, that have been published in this country by C. Scribner & Co., in an English form, under the editorship of Dr. P. Schaff, assisted by a number of eminent

American scholars as co-laborers. The Commentary on the New Testament is completed, in Germany, with the exception of the Book of Revelation. Of the Old Testament, five parts have thus far appeared—Genesis, Deuteronomy, Judges, and Ruth, and the two divisions announced above.

Dr. Lange, of the University of Bonn, in Prussia, himself a theologian of the first rank, and one of the chief laborers in this Bible-work, (Matthew, Mark, John, Romans, James, in part, and Genesis, being all from his hand,) has united with him a number of the fittest men in Germany for so important a task. The "work," thus far, "praises the master-hands" that have wrought it. The various parts, of course, have different degrees of merit. Dr. Lange's own productions are among the best; and the most important books are from his hand.

It is also proper to add, that Dr. Lange himself being of a thoroughly evangelical mold, in opposition to every form of those rationalistic tendencies in Germany that have, for the last half century, so greatly marred German Biblical exegesis, and rendered much of it worthless, has also selected as fellow-laborers only true evangelical men; so that this will be truly a Bible-work free from all taint of unbelief. As an illustration: a portion of the New Testament, Part IX, embracing Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, was committed to Dr. D. Schenkel, of Heidelberg, before this man revealed, as he lately has done, his unbelieving rationalism. Although, perhaps, no trace of his "false way" can be found in this work, yet Dr. Lange has decided, and announced, that this part shall be recommitted to other and safer hands.

The Commentary is, therefore, exegetical, (in a very thoroughly *critical* manner,) doctrinal, ethical, and homiletical. An entirely new critical translation is given throughout, as the basis of the Commentary. This reveals both the unbiased freedom, the wisdom, and the conscientious care for truth and light on the part of him who conceived the work. The American-English translation loses the full benefit of this, one of the chief features of the original, in retaining the common English version as the basis.

A good translation and exposition of the poetical books of the Old Testament is greatly to be desired. This is a task of no common magnitude. The scholarship, taste, and exegetical talent must necessarily be of the best class, to give us something worth the appreciation of the present Christian world.

The translation of the poetical books of Solomon is, as it ought to be, also in verse; retaining and imitating, as much as is possible and proper, the form of the Hebrew original. Dr. Zoekler, so far as we are able to judge, has done his work well. These books deserve a more extended notice than can be given here. They have awakened much discussion, especially Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song of Songs.

We may add that the original German work, while well and substantially

gotten up, is sold at a price far below the American edition. In Germany such expensive editions would not sell. Dr. Lange, we know, is himself surprised at the cost of the American edition; yet we recommend every one who can to buy it, as it is a work of first-class merit, in some things an improvement on the original, and well worth the price.

REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

1.—*Revue Chrétienne. Paris. Mars; Avril; Mai. 1868.*

M. NAVILLE continues in the March and concludes in the April number of this review his articles on "The Adversaries of Philosophy," giving us five more examples, namely: Moleschott, Renan, Claude Bernard, Littré, and Auguste Comte. In the four pages devoted to M. Renan, we have a fine refutation of this author's "glittering generalities," and a refutation all the more striking because the windy apostle of materialistic pantheism is convicted out of his own mouth. Indeed, we are bound to say of all the papers, that they are both brilliant and thorough, disposing of the subtuges and sophisms of the opponents of speculative philosophy in a masterly manner. We commend them to the consideration of those who worship at the shrines of materialism and positivism. We wish they could be put into the hands of every one of those half-thinkers who have been caught in the snares of these pernicious systems.

In the April number is presented an excellent lecture, recently delivered at Geneva, by M. Eugène Bersier (one of the editors of the *Revue*), on the subject of "Independent Ethics." It is known that of late years a party has arisen in France which, insisting that the moral law is sufficient for all the purposes of human existence, speculative or practical, repudiates all connection with religion and philosophy. This party has an organ, bearing the title *La Morale Indépendante*, the first number of which gave the following declaration of principles:

"There is a law *par excellence*, conformable to reason, written in our hearts, whose voice dictates to us our rights and our duties, whose threats turn us from evil. This law is not subject to derogation or change. No power on earth can free us from it. It has no need of commentator or interpreter. It is the same every where, the same to-day and to-morrow; it embraces all peoples and all ages. Not to obey it is to disown one's self, to despoil one's self of his character as a human being, to inflict the most terrible penalty, even though one escape all punishment [usually accounted such]."

These are the "noble and proud words" which M. Bersier quotes to show what the school of "independent ethics" proposes. But he says, in reading them he has a vague recollection of having met with them before, and finds that they have been borrowed from Cicero, "taken literally from the third book, chapter twenty-second. of his Republic." Why does not the

journal which gives them as its own indicate the source? he asks. "Perhaps it would have been embarrassing to cite those which immediately follow; for Cicero continues, in substance: 'Everywhere, in all times, this immutable and holy law will reign, and with it will reign God, the master and the king of the world—God, who made, promulgated, and sanctioned it.'" Of course, it would not have done for the organ of a school which utterly ignores God in ethics to draw attention, in its programme, to this thought of the pagan philosopher, which is in flagrant contradiction with its thesis. M. Bersier does not, however, content himself with pointing out such indications of weakness; he proceeds to test, in all possible directions, the soundness of the fundamental dogma of the new school. Among other things, he demonstrates clearly that, while this school boasts of being the lineal descendant and heir of Kant, it is, in reality, at war with the fundamental thought of the great philosopher, as developed in the "Critique of the Practical Reason," namely: that "if God can not be proved scientifically, we are compelled to believe in him by the same necessity which compels our belief in duty." God, the triumph of the moral order, and personal immortality—these are, according to Kant, the inseparable corollaries of ethics, or, to employ his own term, the postulates of the practical reason. The article is a fine discussion of the essential relation of morals to religion, and we look with interest for the work which we understand M. Bersier has in press, on this subject.

A large part of the May number is taken up with a most thorough and searching review of M. Vacherot's new work on Religion. The paper is divided into six sections, the first two of which are devoted to a brilliant comparison of the work under consideration with that of Benjamin Constant on the same subject, published forty years ago. The age in which each was written is depicted with a few masterly strokes, and each is shown to be the legitimate offspring of its time and of the forces at work therein. But how different the conclusion to which they come! Constant was of the opinion that religion is natural to man, and by its very nature immortal; Vacherot regards it only as an accident of man's history, at best only a phase in his development, and destined to disappear entirely. With Constant it is only the form which is evanescent; with Vacherot the substance vanishes also. In distinguishing the immutable and universal religious sentiment from the variable and perfectible religious form, Constant took an immense step toward a proper estimate of the essence of religion; in confounding the appearance with the essence, Vacherot cuts himself off from the possibility of understanding his subject. Yet his book is, nevertheless, exceedingly able, and the reviewer, although differing with him *toto celo*, treats him with the greatest respect, confessing that the work before him "has nothing in common with the attacks directed against religion by light and superficial minds."

2.—*Fahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie.* 1869. *Zweites Heft.*

A RICH table of contents presents itself to us in the current number of this exceedingly valuable periodical. Prof. Diestel opens with a long (58 pages) and interesting article on the "Church Estimate of the Old Testament." We suppose it to be the pith and marrow of an extensive work which the author published last year, ("History of the Old Testament in the Christian Church,") wherein he gives a detailed account of the scientific treatment, theological appreciation, and practical application of the sacred books of the Hebrews in the Church. But, besides being interesting, the article contains a mine of information, and will repay the most careful perusal. Next, we have a series of "Observations," by Dr. Sieffert, on the doctrines of Paul, and more particularly in regard to the relation of the Epistle to the Galatians to the Epistle to the Romans. These observations are directed against the Tübingen theory concerning the genuineness of the Pauline letters, and present points well worthy of notice by persons who have made a special study of the subject. Next follows a lecture delivered before the Evangelical Union in Hanover, by Dr. Fr. Düsterdieck, on "Ancient Christian Worship," which contains, in pleasing form, much that is interesting to the general reader, but nothing that is new to scholars. This is followed by an article, by Dr. Von Bethmann-Hollweg, on the "State-Veto in the Election of Bishops," suggested by the difficulty between the Grand Duchy of Baden and the Roman Curia concerning the archbishopric of Freiburg. The concluding article is one by Diaconus Gundert on "The Sojourn of the Apostle Peter in Rome," an exceedingly able and scholarly paper, which shows conclusively that there is not one iota of proof, or even a probability, that Peter ever was in Rome. It is particularly gratifying to read so clear and straightforward a statement and discussion of the question after having been surfeited with such a medley of false citation and disingenuous reasoning as the "Catholic World" (June number) spreads before its readers in the article headed "St. Peter, First Bishop of Rome."

3.—*Theologischer Jahresbericht—von* WILHELM HAUCK. *Vierter Jahrgang. Zweites Quartalheft, über die Schriften des Jahres 1868, von April bis Juni.* Wiesbaden: Julius Niedner. 1869. Philadelphia: Schaefer & Koradi.

THIS Quarterly Report covers 270 pages, and, as it notices only the publications of three months, is itself, in its extent, a proof of the activity of the German theological mind in a literary way. Every department of theological literature is here represented. We notice, especially, a number of productions on the person of Christ, both from the rationalistic and the evangelical stand-point. This is, at present, one of the most exciting questions in Germany, and promises to be so yet for some time to come. Every side

of the great question, "Who is Christ?" "What think you of Christ?" is brought into light. History, ancient and modern, general and special, occupies a large space in the Report, as also does Ascetic religious literature, which has such a large development in Germany. We find, as usual, translations, expositions, and commentaries of various parts of the Bible. Hauck's *Theologischer Jahresbericht* gives perhaps the fullest and best notice of the theological and religious publications in Germany. We find here not only the names of new works, but the character and contents of the most important ones are also given impartially, and at considerable length.

4.—*Theologische Studien und Kritiken. Jahrgang 1869. Zweites Heft. Drittes Heft.*

THE second and third numbers of this first-class German theological quarterly, for the present year, are, as usually, freighted with articles of interest and solid worth. In the second, under the head of *Abhandlungen*—elaborate original articles—we have, 1, The third article from Riehm "On the Characteristics of the Messianic Prophecies, and their relation to the fulfillment thereof;" 2, The Epistle to the Ephesians, by Kiere. The minor articles embrace psychologico-moral remarks with reference to the History and Doctrine of the Fall, by Sack; a review, by Tholuck, of Dorner's History of Protestant Theology; another, by Ruetschli, of Kamphausen's "The Prayer of the Lord Explained;" also, the Programme of the Society of the Hague for Defense of the Christian Religion, for 1868. In the third number we have a very complete and admirable sketch of Dr. Rothe, by Achelis; an article by Dietz, on the Doctrine of the Inspiration of the Scriptures; and one by Kloepper, on the Meaning and Purpose of Romans v, 12-21; besides a number of smaller articles—all of interest.

5.—*Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung, zugleich ein Archiv für die neueste Geschichte und Statistik der Christlichen Kirche. Achtundzwanzigster Jahrgang. 1869. Januar, Februar, März, April. Darmstadt und Leipzig: Eduard Zernin.*

THIS is one of the most valuable and substantial of the German Protestant journals. Its stand-point is Lutheran, but free and liberal. It is evidently not inspired by the strict and fierce Old Lutheran exclusionism and confessionalism that yet characterize some of the Lutherans of Germany and America who still glory in the *damnamus secus docentes* of the old Augsburg Confession. It is also evangelical; free from the destructive Rationalism that corrupts and disfigures so much of German Protestant theology and literature. The *Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung* has undertaken, as one of its chief tasks, (its *aufgabe*, as the Germans would say,) to defend, bravely